

A corpus-based study of the complementation of the verb *convince* in recent British English and three Postcolonial Englishes

Tuulia Taatila
University of Tampere
Faculty of Communication Sciences
Master's Programme in English Language and Literature
Master's Thesis
November 2017

Tampereen yliopisto
Viestintätieteiden tiedekunta
Englannin kielen ja kirjallisuuden maisteriopinnot

TAATILA, TUULIA: A corpus-based study of the complementation of the verb *convince* in recent British English and three Postcolonial Englishes

Pro gradu -tutkielma, 68 sivua

Marraskuu 2017

Tämä pro gradu -tutkielma käsittelee verbin *convince* komplementaatiota neljässä eri englannin varieteetissa, Britannian englannissa ja kolmessa jälkikoloniaalisessa englannissa. Tutkielman tavoitteena on selvittää, millaisia komplementtityyppejä esiintyy verbin *convince* kanssa Britannian, Uuden-Seelannin, Etelä-Afrikan ja Malesian englannissa ja vertailla, eroaako komplementaatio eri varieteettien välillä. Tutkielman aineistona toimii esimerkkilauseet GloWbE-korpuksessa, The Corpus of Global Web-Based English. GloWbE-korpus sisältää noin 1,9 miljardia sanaa kahdestakymmenestä eri maasta. Korpus mahdollistaa hakujen tekemisen haluttujen varieteettien sisällä. Korpuksen tekstit on kerätty Internetistä vuonna 2012.

Tutkielman teoriaosassa käsitellään komplementaatioon, *convince*-verbiin ja maailmanenglanteihin liittyvää teoriaa ja aikaisempia tutkimuksia. Teoriaosa määrittelee, mitä on komplementaatio, kartoittaa erilaisia komplementaatioon liittyviä periaatteita ja *convince*-verbin merkityksiä ja kertoo, millaisia komplementteja verbillä on aiemmin havaittu. Lähteinä käytetään esimerkiksi kielioppikirjoja ja sanakirjoja, kuten *the Oxford English Dictionary*. Teoriaosassa käsitellään myös maailmanenglanteja ja esitellään tutkielmaan valitut varieteetit ja Schneiderin dynaaminen malli jälkikoloniaalisten englantien kehittymisestä. Tutkielman analyysiosassa esitellään korpusaineisto ja löydetty komplementtityypit ja pyritään löytämään vastauksia kysymyksiin, kuten mitkä ovat yleisimmin käytetyt komplementit ja vaikuttaako tuloksiin se, missä kehitysvaiheessa varieteetti on. Aineisto rajattiin 300 esimerkkilauseeseen jokaisesta varieteetistä, yhteensä 1200. Tutkielmassa ei kuitenkaan oteta huomioon sellaisia lauseita, joissa verbiä *convince* oli käytetty kuten adjektiivia. Jokaisesta löydetystä komplementtityypistä annetaan esimerkkejä analyysiosiossa ja vertaillaan eri tyyppien yleisyyksiä eri varieteeteissa.

Tutkimuksen tulokset osoittavat, että *convince* valitsee useita eri komplementteja ja yleisimmät näistä ovat [+NP+*that*-clause], [+NP+*to*-infinitive-clause] ja [+NP]. Nämä ovat yleisimmät komplementit jokaisessa tutkitussa varieteetissa ja myös *the Oxford English Dictionary*ssa. Yhteensä aineistossa esiintyviä komplementteja on 12, joista 7 on sanakirjoissa aiemmin mainittuja malleja ja 5 on uusia innovatiivisia malleja. Yllättävää on, että uusilla komplementtityypeillä on vain vähän esiintymiä. Suosituimmat komplementit ovat vanhoja tyyppisiä. Neljä suosituinta tyyppiä vie 95 % tuloksista. Nämä neljä suosituinta tyyppiä ovat samat kaikissa varieteeteissa, joten siltä osin komplementaatio ei eroa brittienglannin ja jälkikoloniaalisten englantien välillä, mutta eroavaisuuksia löytyy käytössä olevien komplementtien määrässä: jälkikoloniaalisilla englannilla on enemmän komplementteja käytössä kuin brittienglannilla. Näyttäisi siltä, että se, missä vaiheessa varieteetti on Schneiderin dynaamisessa mallissa, vaikuttaa tuloksiin: mitä nuorempi varieteetti, sitä enemmän komplementtityyppejä käytössä.

Avainsanat: komplementaatio, korpuslingvistiikka, verbi, *convince*

Table of contents

1. Introduction	1
2. Complementation	4
2.1. Structural types of complement clause	5
2.2. Distinction between complements and adjuncts	5
2.3. Complexity principle	6
2.4. The <i>horror aequi</i> principle	7
2.5. Extractions	7
3. Earlier work on <i>convince</i>	8
3.1. <i>Convince</i> in dictionaries	8
3.2. <i>Convince</i> in grammar books	12
3.3. Distinction between dynamic and stative passives	13
3.4. Active vs passive sentences	14
4. World Englishes	16
4.1. Varieties of English	16
4.2. Schneider's Dynamic Model of the evolution of Postcolonial Englishes	19
4.3. British English	23
4.4. New Zealand English	23
4.5. Malaysian English	25
4.6. South African English	26
5. Material and methods	29
5.1. Corpus linguistics	29
5.2. Linguistic patterns	30
5.3. The Corpus of Global Web-Based English	31
6. Analysis of data	33
6.1. Excluded tokens	33
6.2. Corpus findings	36
6.3. Patterns found in the dictionaries	44
6.3.1. NP+ <i>that</i> -clause	45
6.3.2. NP+ <i>to</i> -infinitive-clause	46
6.3.3. NP	47
6.3.4. NP+ <i>of</i> +NP	47
6.3.5. NP+ <i>wh</i> -clause	48
6.3.6. NP+ <i>about</i> +NP	48
6.3.7. <i>of</i> +NP	49
6.3.8. NP+ <i>of</i> + <i>wh</i> -clause	50
6.4. New patterns	50
6.4.1. zero	50
6.4.2. <i>that</i> -clause	52
6.4.3. NP+ <i>ing</i> -clause	53
6.4.4. NP+ <i>on</i> +NP	54
6.4.5. NP+ <i>about</i> + <i>wh</i> -clause	54
7. Discussion	56
8. Conclusion	63
9. Bibliography	65

1. Introduction

There are many different ways to continue this sentence: *This book convinced...* It is the purpose of this thesis to find out what these patterns are and whether these patterns that follow the verb *convince* are different in different varieties of English or not.

The topic of my thesis is the complementation of the verb *convince*. This is a synchronic, corpus-based study where I will compare the complement patterns of *convince* in the recent British English with the patterns of some new postcolonial varieties of English. Four varieties of English are chosen for this thesis. These are Great Britain, and three postcolonial varieties: New Zealand, Malaysia, and South Africa. The data consists of 1200 tokens, 300 tokens per variety, and it comes from the GloWbE corpus, The Corpus of Global Web-Based English.

This thesis consists of two parts. The first part (chapters 2, 3, and 4) is a theory part that introduces some background information and earlier work on complementation, *convince*, and Postcolonial Englishes. The second part of the thesis (chapters 5, 6, and 7) introduces my own data and the complement patterns found, and tries to find answers to the research questions. The main goal is to find out whether the complement patterns of *convince* in new varieties of English differ from the British English and if so, how.

For background and earlier work on *convince*, I will be using grammars like Biber et al., Huddleston and Pullum, and Quirk et al., and dictionaries like the *Oxford English Dictionary* and *Collins Cobuild English Language Dictionary*. Theory on complementation is also found in the grammars and for example articles of Huang and Rohdenburg. For theory on the Postcolonial Englishes I will present Schneider's Dynamic Model of the evolution of Postcolonial Englishes. I will also shortly introduce the varieties discussed in this thesis using for example Schneider's works as reference.

Schneider states about Postcolonial Englishes that “in new varieties, in the process of structural nativization, verbs begin to allow and later prefer new structures to complement them and build a complete sentence” (2007: 86). Thus, new complement patterns can be found in the new varieties of English. This takes a long time and according to Schneider (2007: 86), “[d]uring the transition phase we therefore find variability, the coexistence of old and new forms, with the latter typically spreading in the S-curve fashion”. It seems that it is possible that the phase at which the Postcolonial English in question is may affect the results. In the first phases, there can be variability and coexistence of old and also new forms. In varieties that are in later phases, there can be more new forms and the new forms might be preferred. This is also the hypothesis for this thesis. It will be interesting to see if this happens in my varieties and if the new Postcolonial Englishes use the same complement patterns as British English, or whether they have new, innovative patterns and have discarded the old ones.

Following this, my research questions for this thesis are:

- (1) What kind of complement patterns of the verb *convince* can be found in British English and in the postcolonial varieties of English examined here (New Zealand, Malaysia, and South Africa)?
- (2) Does the complementation differ between British English and the postcolonial varieties?
- (3) Can Schneider’s Dynamic Model and the phase of the postcolonial variety explain the possible differences between the varieties?

This topic is worth studying because it can give more specific information about the complement patterns of *convince* and about the formation of Postcolonial Englishes. The verb *convince* selects more than one type of construction as its complement. Knowing how this verb behaves and what kind of patterns it can have, can be helpful when teaching and learning English. Hunston states that it is important to be aware of patterns when teaching languages because “it can facilitate the development of both accuracy and fluency” (2002: 167). The modern day technology

and the use of large electronic corpora have made this kind of study easier. As Hunston (*ibid.*) says, electronic corpora allow studies done in greater detail and studies of variation between registers.

Also, I think that it is interesting to study the variation of language. This will expand our knowledge of the language and of the world.

2. Complementation

In order to understand the purpose of this thesis, the concept of complementation has to be defined. Biber et al. describe complement clause as “a type of dependent clause used to complete the meaning relationship of an associated verb or adjective in a higher clause” (1999: 658). Thus, complements complete the meaning of the verb. Quirk et al. (1985: 65) note that on the syntactic level, complements can be either obligatory or optional. I will talk more about the distinctive features of complements in subchapter 2.2.

In this chapter, I will describe the distinction between complements and adjuncts, and what structural types complement clauses can have. Furthermore, I will explain some factors bearing on complementation, namely the Complexity Principle, *horror aequi*, and extractions. If these factors appear in my data, it is necessary to know these factors in order to be able to identify the complement patterns properly.

2.1. Structural types of complement clause

Biber et al. (1999: 658) distinguish four major structural types for complement clauses, and these are *that*-clauses, *to*-infinitive clauses, *wh*-clauses, and *ing*-clauses. All these types are used for different purposes and they can have different discourse functions, for example *that*-clause is used mainly to report speech (Biber et al. 1999: 660). *That*-clauses and *to*-infinitive clauses are more than twice as common as *wh*-clauses and *ing*-clauses (Biber et al. 1999: 754). Biber et al. (1999: 680) also mention that with *that* complementizer, there is a choice whether to keep *that* or omit it. This does not have any effect on meaning, but for example different registers have different preferences whether to use it or not. In conversation, *that* is usually omitted and in academic prose it is usually retained (Biber et al. 1999: 680). *Wh*-clauses are either interrogative clauses or nominal

relative clauses, and infinitive clauses are used to report general actions like speech and intentions (Biber et al. 1999: 683, 693). *Ing*-clauses were not mentioned as a possible pattern for *convince* in the *OED* or in any other of the dictionaries so I will not discuss them further.

2.2. Distinction between complements and adjuncts

Huang (1997: 75) distinguishes two elements that can follow a verb, complements and adjuncts. One of their differences is that complements help to complete the meaning of the sentence and adjuncts do not (Huang 1997: 75). Adjuncts only provide additional information (Huang 1997: 77).

Huddleston and Pullum (2002: 219-227) list eight factors that distinguish complements from adjuncts. These eight factors are licensing, obligatoriness, anaphora, category, position, argumenthood, selection, and role. The first five factors are syntactic differences and the last three are semantic issues (Huddleston and Pullum 2002: 219). Of these eight factors, I will concentrate on licensing and obligatoriness.

Complements require a verb that licenses them, and verbs have subcategories according to the types of complements they license (Huddleston and Pullum 2002: 219). Different subcategories of verbs, like intransitive or monotransitive verbs, take different patterns of complements (Huddleston and Pullum 2002: 220). Huddleston and Pullum (2002: 219) give an example of licensing: the verb *mention* licenses an object, as in “*She mentioned the letter.*” *Mention* has to have an object, otherwise the sentence is not correct. Adjuncts, unlike complements, are not restricted to any particular verb, like an adjunct *at that time* that can occur without a particular verb (Huddleston and Pullum 2002: 219).

Huddleston and Pullum state that complements are sometimes obligatory and sometimes optional, but adjuncts are always optional (2002: 221). An obligatory complement

cannot be omitted without loss of grammaticality and obligatory complements are needed to complete the meaning of the verb (Huddleston and Pullum 2002: 221).

In the case of *convince*, the obligatory nature of complement is seen in sentences like: **I convinced*. The meaning of this sentence is not clear. Without the complement, for example a noun phrase *him* in this sentence, the sentence is ungrammatical.

2.3. Complexity Principle

Rohdenburg (1996: 149, 151) mentions the Complexity Principle which describes the distribution of competing structures:

In the case of more or less explicit grammatical options the more explicit one(s) will tend to be favored in cognitively more complex environments. (Rohdenburg 1996: 151)

These more complex environments are caused by complexity factors such as passive constructions, subordinate clauses, long subjects, or discontinuous constructions (Rohdenburg 1996: 149). Rohdenburg gives a simple example of a sentence where there is a choice between two possible complements, a more explicit *to*-infinitive and a less explicit bare infinitive:

- (a) I helped him to write the paper.
- (b) I helped him write the paper. (1996: 151).

Although not much difference in meaning, the more explicit variants tend to be treated as more formal ones (Rohdenburg 1996: 152).

The Complexity Principle basically means that if a sentence includes for example a long subject, which is a complexity factor, according to the Complexity Principle, one could expect the more explicit grammatical option to be used, for example *to*-infinitive. If the implicit option, in this case the bare infinitive instead of the *to*-infinitive, is chosen, the principle is violated. But this is not an absolute rule, just a tendency. This principle, however, may play a part in the distribution of complement patterns.

2.4. The *horror aequi* principle

This principle may also affect the choice of complement pattern. As stated by Rohdenburg (2003: 236), the *horror aequi* principle “involves the widespread (and presumably universal) tendency to avoid the use of formally (near-) identical and (near-) adjacent (non-coordinate) grammatical elements or structures”, like *-ing* forms or *to*-infinitives. Mair (2002: 125) also talks about this tendency to avoid a sequence of two similar grammatical constructions, for example two *to*-infinitives. This can be avoided, for example, by using the *to*-infinitive with a bare infinitive instead of another *to*-infinitive (Mair 2002: 125).

2.5. Extractions

Extractions, or as Huang (1997: 123) calls them, transformations, change the word order in a sentence, not changing the deep structure or complementation pattern. Extractions can occur with *wh*-questions, topicalized sentences, and relative clauses. Huang (1997: 123, 129) gives examples of these three cases:

- (1) What is John buying?
- (2) John's articles, I will never read.
- (3) What he will say is unclear to me.

For example in the sentence (2) the object “John's articles” has been topicalized (Huang 1997: 129) and it has the same deep structure as “I will never read John's articles.”, so the complement of *read* is [+NP].

This is needed to know in order to find out the real complement pattern. One needs to recognize that there is an extraction, otherwise the complement pattern is not visible.

3. Earlier work on *convince*

3.1. *Convince* in dictionaries

The entry for the verb *convince* in the *Oxford English Dictionary* (the *OED*) also includes the etymology of the verb. The verb comes originally from Latin verb *convincere*, which means “to overcome, conquer, convict, demonstrate”. The verb consists of two parts, *con-*, meaning “altogether, wholly”, and *vincere*, “to conquer”.

The *Oxford English Dictionary* gives a list of different senses of the verb *convince*. There are eight different senses, but only one of them is in use today, the others are marked obsolete. It has to be pointed out that the online edition of the *OED* says under the entry for *convince* that the entry “has not yet been fully updated”, thus, it is possible that all the existing complements are not represented there. The one sense that is in use also has subcategories. Obsolete senses have been left out from this thesis. Their examples are mainly before year 1700, and in this thesis, I will concentrate on modern English after 1700. There are, however, some illustrations in the obsolete senses that are from a later year than 1700. I will give examples of these but I am not going to take them into account. For example sense 4a, “To prove (a person) to be guilty, or in the wrong, *esp.* by judicial procedure; to prove or find guilty; to convict *of*, rarely *for*, *in* (an offence or error) *Obs.*” has an illustration with [+NP] complement from 1776: “Instead of clearing, this paper only serves to convince her” (S. FOOTE *Bankrupt*). Also sense 5c (5: “To demonstrate or prove (orig. something reprehensible, but subsequently also in a neutral or good sense) *Obs.*”; c: “*that* a thing is something. *Obs.*”) has an illustration later than 1700: “Sufficient to convince, that without doubt Herod’s Amphitheatres were of Wood.” (A. GORDON tr. F. S. Maffei *Compl. Hist. Anc. Amphitheatres* 1730).

In this table, I will look at the sense still in use, number 3 in the *OED*. I will give the *OED* entry, give illustrations from the *OED*, and identify the complement in the example. I have chosen examples that are later than 1700.

Table 1. Sense 3 of *convince* in the *OED*

The <i>OED</i> entry / sense	Illustrations of usage from the <i>OED</i>	Complement pattern
a. To cause (a person) to admit, as established to his satisfaction, that which is advanced in argument; to bring to acknowledge the truth <i>of</i> ; to satisfy or persuade by argument or evidence. In <i>pass.</i> , To be brought to, or to have, a full conviction; to be firmly persuaded.	1763 W. SHENSTONE <i>Elegies</i> vi, in <i>Wks.</i> (1764) Translate the song; convince my doubting maid. 1773 <i>Ann. Reg.</i> 1772 'I am confuted, but not convinced' is an apology sometimes offered. 1875 B. JOWETT tr. Plato <i>Dialogues</i> (ed. 2) I am convinced..and have nothing more to object.	+NP adjectival use adjectival use
b. <i>of</i> a fact.	1697 DRYDEN tr. Virgil <i>Georgics</i> IV Convinc'd of Conquest, he resum'd his shape. 1826 T. BEWICK <i>Hist. Brit. Birds</i> (ed. 6) But having since seen several..[the editor] is convinced of the mistake. 1879 J. LUBBOCK <i>Sci. Lect.</i> vi. It is never very difficult to convince one's self of what one wishes to believe.	adjectival use adjectival use +NP+ <i>of</i> + <i>wh</i> -clause
c. with <i>subord. clause</i> .	1791 W. COWPER <i>Let.</i> 27 May (1982) No man shall convince me that I am improperly govern'd while I feel the contrary. 1862 J. RUSKIN <i>Munera Pulveris</i> (1880) My neighbour cannot be convinced that I am wiser than he is.	+NP+ <i>that</i> -clause +NP+ <i>that</i> -clause
d. To produce a moral conviction <i>of</i> sinfulness.	1853 F.W. ROBERTSON <i>Serm.</i> (1872) By convincing of sin, by humbling the man. 1880 J.A. FROUDE <i>Bunyan</i> A man of fervid temperament suddenly convinced of sin.	<i>of</i> +NP <i>of</i> +NP

e. Phrase. <i>to convince any one's belief. Obs.</i>	Obsolete, so examples left out.	
f. To induce, prevail upon, persuade. Const. <i>to</i> with <i>inf.</i> orig. <i>U.S.</i>	1977 J. HODKINS <i>Invention of World</i> They..convinced the priest to bless it. 1979 D. HALBERSTAM <i>Powers that Be</i> (1980) He worked very hard personally to convince Ike to run. 1983 <i>Observer</i> Barril's overtures failed to convince him to come out of hiding.	+NP+ <i>to</i> -infinitive +NP+ <i>to</i> -infinitive +NP+ <i>to</i> -infinitive

Complement patterns that are present in the *OED* illustrations in the non-obsolete senses are [+NP], [+*of*+NP], [+NP+*of*+*wh*-clause], [+NP+*that*-clause], [+NP+*of*+NP], and [+NP+*to*-infinitive]. Some of the illustrations are used as adjectival, stative passive, rather than dynamic passive. For example the illustration “I am convinced..and have nothing more to object.” (B. JOWETT 1875) has an adjectival use, not a verbal one. I will therefore set these illustrations aside and concentrate on the verbal uses. This is discussed more in 3.3.

Some of the illustrations were dynamic passives; those I changed into corresponding actives and I identified the pattern according to the active. For example J. Ruskin's illustration “My neighbour cannot be convinced that I am wiser than he is.” is in dynamic passive. Here the corresponding active is “I cannot convince my neighbour that I am wiser than he is”, so the complement pattern here is [+NP+*that*-clause]. I will talk more about dynamic and stative passives in chapter 3.3.

The most common patterns used in the *OED* illustrations were [+NP], [+NP+*that*-clause], and [+NP+*to*-infinitive]. There were also many adjectival uses, but these were only present in subsenses *a* and *b*.

Common patterns that *Collins Cobuild Advanced Learner's Dictionary* mentions are [+NP+*of*+NP], [+NP+*that*-clause], and [+NP+*to*-infinitive]. [+NP+*of*+NP] and [+NP+*that*-clause] are used with meaning “If someone or something **convinces** you **of** something, they make you

believe that it is true or that it exists”. With [+NP+*to*-infinitive], the meaning of the verb is ‘persuade’: “If someone or something **convinces** you **to** do something, they persuade you to do it.”

Sequences that occur frequently are also listed in *Collins Cobuild English Language Dictionary*: The verb *convince* can occur in sequences [+NP+*that*-clause] (where *that* can often be omitted), [+NP+*wh*-clause], [+NP], [+NP+prep] (preposition being either *about* or *of*). In these sequences, the meaning of the verb is ‘assure’. The other sequence mentioned is [+NP+*to*-infinitive] and in this sense, the meaning of the verb is ‘prevail upon’.

Oxford Advanced Learner’s Dictionary lists two different senses of the verb, ‘make somebody feel certain; cause somebody to realize’, and it is used with sequences [+NP], [+NP+PP] (where the preposition is *of*), and [+NP+*that*-clause]. The sense ‘persuade’ is used with sequence [+NP+*to*-infinitive].

All dictionaries list as frequently occurring patterns [+NP+*that*-clause] and [+NP+*to*-infinitive]. Different versions of pattern [+NP+*of*+NP] or [+NP+PP] are also mentioned. In all dictionaries, the sequence [+NP+*to*-infinitive] is listed as being used with the meaning ‘persuade’, and it is used especially in the US. The only additions that the other dictionaries have to the list of complementation patterns present in the *OED* are [+NP+*wh*-clause], which was not present in the *OED* illustrations, and the preposition *about*, which was not mentioned in the *OED*.

Table 2. The complement patterns of *convince* mentioned in different dictionaries.

	NP	<i>of</i> +NP	NP+ <i>of</i> + <i>wh</i> - clause	NP+ <i>that</i> - clause	NP+ <i>of</i> + NP	NP+ <i>to</i> - infinitive	NP+ <i>wh</i> - clause	NP+ <i>about</i> + NP
Oxford English Dictionary	x	x	x	x	x	x		
Collins Cobuild Advanced Learner’s Dictionary				x	x	x		
Collins Cobuild English Language	x			x	x	x	x	x

Dictionary								
Oxford Advanced Learner's Dictionary	x			x	x	x		

In Table 2 I have used my own labeling of patterns, which means that I have looked for what patterns occur in different dictionaries and grammars and then I have combined those to form the patterns listed in this table. Later I will add some patterns to possible complement patterns of *convince* if there are new patterns found in the data that were not mentioned here.

In *Collins Cobuild*, patterns [+NP+*about*] and [+NP+*of*] were mentioned as complement patterns of *convince*. I doubt that any sentence will end in preposition. There is probably a noun phrase after the preposition. Therefore, I have added the NP to the patterns and instead of a pattern [+NP+*about/of*], which could have been one pattern, I have decided to include two patterns in my table: [+NP+*of*+NP] and [+NP+*about*+NP]. Other choices in labeling the patterns could have been done as well.

3.2. *Convince* in grammar books

Grammar books also give different patterns for *convince*. Biber et al. (1999: 665, 701) list patterns [verb+NP+*that*-clause] and [verb+NP+*to*-clause], or [be verb-*ed*+*to*-clause].

Huddleston and Pullum (2002: 274) state that *convince* is a verb that selects as its complement “a PP complement containing a specified preposition together with its own complement”. This structure is [verb+object+[prep+object]] ([NP+*of*+NP]), and the specified preposition for *convince* is *of* (2002: 278, 279), ‘to convince somebody of something’.

Quirk et al. (1985: 659) also talk about the preposition *of* and how it can be used with *convince*: they note that the preposition *of* occurs normally with *convince*, but it is omitted before *that*-clauses or infinitive clauses. This notion makes such sentences as “*They convinced him of

that they needed more troops” impossible, but “They convinced him that they needed more troops” possible (Quirk et al. 1985: 659). All in all, Quirk et al. mention two different complement types that are both ditransitive complementation, [+NP+*that*-clause] or [+NP+*of*+NP] (1985: 1212, 1208). These patterns were also mentioned by Biber et al. and Huddleston and Pullum.

3.3. Distinction between dynamic and stative passives

Even though I restricted my data to different verb forms of *convince* and chose the definition of a verb in the *OED*, there are still some uses in the *OED* as well as in my data that are clearly illustrations of *convince* used as an adjective instead of a verb. These are cases where *convince* is used as stative passive and it has an adjectival meaning. Cases of *convince* used as an adjective instead of a verb are manually searched and excluded from the data.

Biber et al. (1999: 936) talk about stative passives and dynamic passives. Stative passives “describe the state resulting from an action, rather than the action itself” and dynamic passives instead “describe an action rather than the resulting state” (Biber et al. 1999: 936). So stative passives are more like adjectives describing a state, and dynamic passives are verbal, describing an action. Stative passives, adjectivals, are excluded from this thesis, and dynamic passives are changed into the corresponding actives so that the complementation patterns are visible. The reason why this is possible is explained in chapter 3.4.

Quirk et al. (1985: 413) note that many adjectives may have the same suffixes as participles, like *-ed*. They call these participial adjectives, and they state that the distinction between these adjectives and participles is not always clear (Quirk et al. 1985: 413, 414). One case when it is clear that the *ed*-form is used as verbal is the presence of a *by*-agent phrase (Quirk et al. 1985: 414). Quirk et al. (1985: 414) offer an example: “The man was *offended* by the policeman.” There is the *by*-phrase with a personal agent, so this indicates that it corresponds with the active

form of the sentence (Quirk et al. 1985: 414). In this case, the corresponding active would be “The policeman offended the man”, and the complement is an NP. The agent phrase is, however, usually left unexpressed (Quirk et al. 1985: 165). When premodification is possible with the intensifier *very*, it is clear that the form is adjectival: “The man was very *offended*” (Quirk et al. 1985: 414). As *offended*, *convinced* can also be either verb or adjective.

3.4. Active vs passive sentences

In this subchapter, I am going to explain why dynamic passives can be changed into corresponding actives when analyzing the complement patterns.

As Perlmutter and Soames (1979: 30) note, there are passive and active sentences in English. It can be argued whether these sentences have same underlying structures, or if they are different. Perlmutter and Soames argue that they have same underlying structures (ibid.). This is an important argument when analyzing some of the tokens that are in passive voice. Passive sentences cannot be analyzed as such, but they have to be changed into actives. This is possible because as said before, passives and actives have the same underlying structures (Perlmutter and Soames 1979: 34). In passive sentences, the complement pattern is not visible, so the passive sentences are changed into corresponding actives and then the complementation pattern is analyzed.

One of the two generalizations why Perlmutter and Soames argue that active and passive sentences are derived from the same underlying structure is that “the class of possible subjects that a verb can have in passive sentences is identical with the class of possible objects that it can have in active sentences” (1979: 31). This generalization can be seen in my example sentence of *convince* in passive:

He was convinced to go by somebody.

In this sentence, *he* is the subject of the sentence. In active, the sentence is as follows:

Somebody convinced him to go.

In the active sentence, *somebody* is the subject and *him* is the object of the sentence. Thus, it can be seen how the subject of a passive sentence is the object of an active sentence. This leads to the note that when analyzing data, passives are changed to corresponding actives so that the complement pattern (in this example sentence: [+NP + *to*-infinitive clause]) is visible.

The other generalization, “[t]he class of NPs that can occur in the *by*-phrase in passive sentences with a given verb is the same as the class of possible subjects that the verb can have in active sentences” (Perlmutter and Soames 1979:32), is seen in the example sentence as well. *Somebody* is the NP that occurs in the *by*-phrase in the passive sentence and it is the same as the subject in the active sentence.

4. World Englishes

In this chapter, I will discuss World Englishes, their categorizations, and Schneider's Dynamic Model. I will also shortly introduce those varieties that I have chosen to study in my thesis: British English, New Zealand English, South African English, and Malaysian English. These varieties were chosen because they are all in different phases in Schneider's Dynamic Model and I will try to find out, if the phase of the variety can explain the differences or similarities between the varieties. Malaysia is in phase 3, South Africa phase 4, and New Zealand in phase 5. I have also tried to choose the countries so that they are situated all around the world.

4.1. Varieties of English

As mentioned before, in my thesis I will try to find out if there is variation in the complement patterns of *convince* in different postcolonial varieties. That is why it is relevant to know what these postcolonial varieties mean and are and what is variation. Next, colonialism, language contact, and varieties are discussed.

English language has spread around the world and become the world's lingua franca and a language of international communication, politics, and the media, and it has also diversified and developed into many new forms, called varieties (Schneider 2007: 1). The biggest reason for the spread of English is colonialism and the spread of the British Empire (ibid.). In addition to colonialism, Mesthrie and Bhatt (2008: 15, 24) also mention industrialization, immigration, and language teaching as factors that have had a big role in the spread of English.

After colonialism, some countries have tried to remove English because it was "the language imposed by foreign, colonial masters", but in most cases, the opposite happened: English stayed, was in contact with indigenous languages and cultures, and started to produce new varieties

(Schneider 2007: 1-2). The reason why dialects and varieties of languages exist is that humans accommodate their speech forms to those who are close to them to express solidarity (Schneider 2007: 8). Minimizing the linguistic differences and using the forms used by the communication partner creates a social bond (Schneider 2007: 27).

Schneider (2011: 190) explains some reasons why new varieties have emerged. He mentions that language is an ongoing process, it is continuously re-enacted and “there is always the possibility of modification” (ibid.). People from different backgrounds interact with each other and their utterances may be picked up by somebody and replicated. Some features are repeated and others not, so this leads to some features spreading and others being forgotten. Those forms and patterns that are “frequently repeated become natural, subconscious habits” (ibid.). These new distinctive features of New Englishes may come from “anywhere in the communicative environment” (ibid.). Mesthrie and Bhatt (2008: 188) note that Standard English was not the only input in the formation of New Englishes: they were also shaped for example by sailors, soldiers, hunters, missionaries, and tradespeople.

Like Schneider (2011: 15) says, in schools we are often taught that there is such a thing as “proper English”, grammar books and dictionaries and teachers tell us what is “right” and everything else is “wrong”. But this is a false look on languages. Schneider (ibid.) states that “[p]eople just talk differently, depending on who they are, where they come from, perhaps whether they are educated or not, and probably even how they feel in a given situation.” And although there are differences, people usually understand each other well enough. The popular idea that there is a “standard” English and the others are “deviant” or “broken” is misguided (Schneider 2007:8). According to Schneider, there are many ways of saying the same thing and “none of them is inherently superior to or worse than any other” (2011: 15). Languages vary and speakers choose different forms according to for example the speaker’s regional origin, gender, age, status, or the context of situation (Schneider 2011: 16). Languages have rules, which “have to be understood as

shared habits in a speech community” and these rules permit choices (Schneider 2011: 19). The choice of form of expression depends for example on the speaker’s background, and this is called ‘language variation’ (ibid.). The term ‘variety’ is a neutral term that is usually used for a group-specific language form, a set of language habits shared by a certain group (Schneider 2011: 16).

As stated by Schneider (2011: 27), languages that are in contact influence each other in many ways. Consequences of contact are for example borrowing or transfer, where for example a structure is taken over from one language context into another, and which often becomes firmly integrated. These New Englishes are also shaped by contact with the indigenous languages of their region, which enriches English, giving “further means of expression”. Pidgins and creoles are also consequences of contact: they are mixed, new languages, born of very intense language contact (Schneider 2011: 27-28). Languages can have regional variation, internal regional differences, variation between individuals, and social background can affect one’s language: social class, education, sex, ethnicity all can affect language (Schneider 2007: 9-10). Languages can have superstrate influence, influence that comes “from above”, from those in power, or substrate influence, which means that contributions are made by indigenous languages and the influence comes from underneath (Schneider 2011: 191).

When different varieties of English that are spoken around the world are discussed, different labels are used. Terms that can be used are World Englishes, which includes all varieties, including for example British English, Malaysian English, and New Zealand English; New Englishes, which is restricted to newly grown second language varieties, like Tanzanian and Indian; and Postcolonial Englishes, which excludes British English but includes American and Australian English (Schneider 2011: 29-30). In my thesis, I use Schneider’s term Postcolonial Englishes when referring to New Zealand, South African, and Malaysian English. I also use the term British English, which is the only variety in my thesis that is not a Postcolonial English, for English spoken in Great Britain.

Different varieties are also categorized in many ways. One classification is to make a distinction between ENL, ESL, and EFL countries: ENL, English as a Native Language, as in the UK, USA, Australia, and New Zealand; ESL, English as a Second Language, in countries where English exists side by side with strong indigenous languages, for example in India, Malaysia, Nigeria, Uganda, and Singapore; and EFL, English as a Foreign Language, countries where English is widely taught and acquired in the formal education system, for example in Egypt and Taiwan (Schneider 2011: 30/Schneider 2007: 12). Another system of classification is Kachru's "Three Circles". This classification consists of Inner Circle, Outer Circle, and Expanding Circle. Inner Circle corresponds with ENL and includes for example USA, Outer Circle with ESL, for example India and Singapore, and Expanding Circle with EFL, for example China and Russia (Schneider 2011: 31). Schneider (2011: 32) states that these classifications are problematic, because they do not fit well for example multilingual countries, like Canada or South Africa. (South Africa is somewhere between ENL-ESL (Schneider 2011: 30).)

A third classification is Dynamic Model, Schneider's proposition of how Englishes in postcolonial contexts typically follow "an underlying, fundamentally uniform evolutionary process" (Schneider 2011: 33). This third categorization is explained here in my thesis more thoroughly in 4.2. and later, each variety is introduced in the light of the Dynamic Model.

4.2. Schneider's Dynamic Model of the evolution of Postcolonial Englishes

Schneider's Model proposes that the evolution of Postcolonial Englishes is a sequence of phases of identity rewritings and linguistic changes (2007: 30). In this subchapter, the model and those five stages are shortly introduced.

Schneider states that Postcolonial Englishes are varieties of English which have emerged in situations involving language contact and they are shaped and determined by

sociohistorical conditions (2007: 8, 21). Schneider's Dynamic Model of the evolution of Postcolonial Englishes claims that when English is relocated in colonies, "there is an underlying uniform process which has driven the individual historical instantiations of PCEs growing in different localities" (2007: 21). According to the model, this shared underlying process "accounts for many similarities between them, and appears to operate whenever a language is transplanted" (Schneider 2007: 29).

The Dynamic Model has two dimensions: five subsequent stages that are marked with characteristic properties, and two complementary communicative perspectives, those of the settlers, the colonizers, and of the indigenous people, the colonized. The five progressive stages are called *foundation*, *exonormative stabilization*, *nativization*, *endonormative stabilization*, and *differentiation* (Schneider 2007: 30). The process of the re-rooting of English can be viewed from two perspectives, the colonizers and the colonized. Schneider calls the settlers' perspective "STL strand" and the perspective of the indigenous populations "IDG strand" (2007: 31). Four constitutive parameters are distinguished in each phase: extralinguistic (sociopolitical) background, identity constructions, sociolinguistic conditions, and typical linguistic consequences (Schneider 2007: 33).

In the first phase, *foundation*, Schneider (2007: 33-36) describes how English is brought to a new territory that was not English-speaking before by settlers. The context is typically for example emigration settlements, foundation of military forts, or trading outposts. The relationship between STL and IDG groups can be friendly or hostile. Both groups see each other clearly as the "other". STL group may regard their stay as temporary and see themselves as part of the British society. IDG people see themselves as the owners of the territory. Each group mainly communicates within themselves. Communication between STL and IDG is required, but it is limited and restricted to for example trading. Usually the immigrating or invading groups do not want to learn the indigenous languages, but in the IDG strand, there develops marginal

bilingualism. Settlers have different regional or social dialects, and this will lead to koinéization as they adjust their pronunciation and lexical usage to form a new, more homogenous variety. In this phase, the indigenous languages have only little influence on English, for example place names are borrowed at this stage.

In the second phase, *exonormative stabilization*, (Schneider 2007: 36-40) the colonies have stabilized politically under foreign (British) dominance and English is regularly spoken. There is increasing contact with the indigenous population. Settlers feel that culturally they still belong to Britain, though they have the colonial experience that the ones who stayed at home do not have. Children of mixed ethnicity are born. For indigenous people, knowledge of English is an asset. More fundamental changes happen in the linguistic system of English: on lexical level, but also on syntactic and morphological structures. English starts to move toward a local language variety. Words for local fauna and flora, cultural terms, and customs are borrowed from the indigenous languages. This is the first phase when the territory's distinctive new structures emerge (ibid.).

The third phase, *nativization*, (Schneider 2007: 40-48) is the most important phase. The STL strand has increasing independence from the mother-country. They are politically and linguistically going in their own way. The gap between the immigrant and indigenous populations is reduced, both parties are permanent residents of the same territory and they have accepted that they have to get along with each other. In the STL strand, people are divided into innovative and conservative speakers. People are insecure about linguistic norms: should they still use the old norms, or can local use be accepted. Localized forms are increasingly more accepted. In this stage there is the heaviest restructuring of English and the new postcolonial English is born. The spread of changes typically follow the "S" curve pattern. Nativization also includes "innovative assignments of verb complementation patterns to individual verbs", so the change in complementation patterns can start in this phase. Mixed codes emerge and multiculturalism is expressed by using mixed varieties (ibid.).

The fourth phase *endonormative stabilization* follows political independence (Schneider 2007: 48-52). Cultural self-reliance is also needed for this phase. New identity construction follows political separation. Typically in the transition between phases 3 and 4 there is an incident, “Event X”, which makes it clear that the settlers are not supported by the former mother country, which may cause the STL strand to feel a sense of isolation, and this will lead to reconstructing a new, locally based identity. The STL strand now sees themselves as members of a new nation that is different from their former homeland. This is “the moment of the birth of a new nation”. Local forms of English are accepted and the former stigma of the new forms is lost due to the fact that the nation has gained psychological independence and accepted their new indigenous identity. Now there is a new language variety, distinct from the original variety. The new variety is seen as homogenous at this phase and that homogeneity is emphasized in order to strengthen the group coherence. Dictionaries and codification of language start to appear, grammar books come later (*ibid.*).

In the fifth phase, *differentiation*, the new nation has reached self-dependence and is relying in its own strengths. Now there is room for internal differentiation. The citizens do not see themselves as a one group anymore, but rather as subgroups with own identities. The new variety has emerged, but this is not the end of the linguistic evolution. This is the starting point of dialect birth (Schneider 2007: 52-54).

As Schneider (2007: 55) notes, this is only a model and a generalization and should not be confused with reality, which is more complex. The duration times of phases vary and the phases may also overlap and the boundaries of stages can be fuzzy. Some characteristics of a phase may sometimes appear earlier, sometimes later (Schneider 2007: 57).

4.3. British English

According to Kortmann and Upton (2004: 28), all the varieties of English in the world have the same origin, and this ancestral language is called Anglo-Saxon or Old English. In the fifth and sixth centuries, West Germanic dialects were brought from mainland Europe to the British islands and they fused into English, which over the centuries evolved to a fusion of many languages, having elements from Celtic, Norse, and French (*ibid.*). In the British islands, “the language in its homeland has had time and motive both to preserve ancient forms and to fragment to a degree unknown elsewhere in the English-speaking world” (Kortmann and Upton 2004: 28).

Later English has spread and developed into many varieties. In the British Isles, there is variation as well, for example Scotland, Wales, Ireland, Northern England, Southern England, and variation within these areas also (Kortmann and Upton 2004: 25).

The subcorpus where the British English data comes from is called Great Britain, hence, that is the term (Great Britain and/or British English) that I will be using in this thesis.

4.4. New Zealand English

In Schneider’s Dynamic Model, New Zealand English has already evolved into phase five (Schneider 2007: 127-133). The phase 1 in New Zealand was in 1790s-1840. Whaling ships and traders were the first to arrive in New Zealand in the late eighteenth century. The settlers had contact with the indigenous people, the Maoris. The settlers had different dialects and koinéization happened. In phase 2 (1840-1907), New Zealand had stable colonial status. Treaty of Waitangi was signed in 1840. This meant that the Maori chiefs yielded sovereignty to the Crown. There was influx of British settlers. In phase 3 (1907-1973), ties with Britain loosened as New Zealand got Dominion status in 1907. In 1947, New Zealand got full independence, but their loyalty was still

strong to the British Empire. At this point New Zealand accent stabilized and external British language norm remained valid. Effects of nativization process were visible on pronunciation and vocabulary. In phase 4 (1973-1990) New Zealand cut loose from the former mother country mentally after Britain joined the EU. They went through painful restructuring of the economy and reorientation toward the Asia-Pacific region and developed a new sense of complete self-dependence. Increased attention was paid to the Maori population, and the country is now officially bilingual. The phase 5 (1990s-) was the beginning of dialectal fragmentation, both regional and social. New Zealand is currently in phase 5. Ethnic varieties, for example Maori English, are emerging (ibid.).

As stated by Hundt et al. (2004: 560), the study of New Zealand English has mainly concentrated on phonology and vocabulary. Syntax and morphology have been absent from studies. Phonology, phonetics, and vocabulary are also areas where New Zealand English differs mostly from other varieties. Some have claimed that New Zealand English grammar is identical with British English grammar, but according to Hundt et al. (2004: 560), this is not the case anymore. Grammar usage in New Zealand is similar to US and Britain, but it still makes sense to speak of New Zealand English morphosyntax.

According to Hundt et al. (2004: 579-580), there are places where New Zealand complementation differs from other Englishes. For example in verbs *protest* and *appeal*: in British English, these both typically take prepositional objects as their complements, whereas in American English, both can be used without a preposition. Corpus sample shows that in NZE *protest* is used without preposition more often than BrE but not as frequently as AmE (ibid.).

Corpus data has shown that NZE shares features with both BrE and AmE but is not identical with either of them (Hundt et al. 2004: 590). Hundt et al. (2004: 588) state that “it will remain difficult to prove whether changes in one national variety are actually due to influence from another variety or whether the development simply coincides with the variants preferred in another

national standard.” New Zealand English grammar may have American influence, but another view is that the innovative forms in New Zealand English often just coincide with the American English form (Hundt et al. 2004: 580).

Hundt et al. (2004: 563) mention the term *colonial lag*, and state that this term describes how New Zealand English, younger colonial variety, is more conservative than American English, older colonial variety, which is more innovative in their use of English.

4.5. Malaysian English

Malaysian English is the newest variety chosen for this thesis. Malaysia’s phases 1 and 2 occurred over the period of 1786-1957 (Schneider 2007: 144-152). In the late eighteenth century the British came to South-East Asia to establish trading outposts and to challenge the Dutch, who had the economic and political power there. There is not a clear transition between phases 1 and 2, because it was “marked by a gradual extension of the colonial grip and impact” (Schneider 2007: 145). In the IDG strand, the Asian population, bilingualism spread, although it was not open to majority and linked with elitism. With the stable colonial status, the demand for English increased, but only those who had higher status had access to English. In addition to Malay (also called Bahasa Malaysia), English was kept as a co-official language. The intention was that the special status of English would be removed and Malay developed into a national language. Bahasa Malaysia secured its position as national language at this time and in many rural regions English is of little use today. In 1996, English was reintroduced as a language of instruction in technical subjects. There has been opposing forces between English and Malay, but Malaysian English has still proceeded into phase 3. In phase 3 (1957-), English is used and widely accessible for daily exposure and easy acquisition. Much of the former elitist character of English is gone and English has undergone structural nativization on all levels of language. It shares similarities with Singaporean English. Variant

complement patterns are mentioned as examples of unique new features. People express personality by code-mixing usually Malay and English. Today Malaysian English is in phase 3, but there are traces of later phases (ibid.).

Schneider (2011: 153) writes that “Malaysia has successfully reduced the role of English and promoted and developed Bahasa Malaysia as a new national language after independence”, but in the twenty-first century, the significance of proficiency in English has been recognized again. There has been back-and-forth movement with English in Malaysia and ambivalent attitudes: English should not gain too much power, but they do not want to let go of it either (ibid.).

Malaysian English can be compared with Standard British English, because as Baskaran (2008: 611) says, Standard British English is “still the grammar of this standard variety (though not the phonology) that is aimed at on the acrolectal level in Malaysia (namely programmed instruction, official media, locally organized international conferences and the like)”.

So Malaysian English can have some Standard British English features, but also influence from other languages. As Baskaran (2008: 610) mentions, the substrate language, Bahasa Malaysia (and also Tamil), has influenced the syntax of Malaysian English in many ways, but “every emerging new variety develops its own system, which is to some extent independent of the background languages”.

4.6. South African English

According to Schneider (2007: 174), South Africa has a complex language situation, and it can belong to both ENL and ESL (or Inner/Outer Circles). It is difficult to identify different phases of the Model. Many PCEs (Black, White, and Indian South African English) come from South Africa, but they are still called under one cover term South African English (SAfE).

Although there is not one “South African English”, that is still the term that I, too, will use in my thesis when I refer to all Englishes spoken in South Africa, to my data, and the subcorpus which is called South Africa.

As stated by Schneider (2007: 175-176), South Africa’s phase 1 started in 1806 when two different English settler groups arrived in South Africa in two waves. 1820 settlers were rural and unsophisticated and the Natal settlers were higher in status and more urban. The British settlers encountered two resident groups: Africans (black) and Afrikaners (known as the Boers). The Boers (Dutch descendants) are seen as IDG strand, as they had lived there for centuries. So in South Africa, there were two distinct STL groups and two IDG groups (ibid.).

The phase 2 (1822/1870s-1910) started when the governor of the colony proclaimed English to be the only official language of the Cape. Growing tensions between the English and the Dutch led to Anglo-Boer Wars, and the outcome of the wars was the unification of the British colonies and the Boer republics. Contact labourers from India were brought to South Africa after the slavery was abolished and people were needed in the sugar plantations. Most of them chose to stay after their contracts expired. They too contributed to the linguistic pool of South Africa (Schneider 2007: 178-179).

The phase 3 (1910-1994) started in 1910 when the political status changed, Britain gained sovereignty in the Boer wars. The gap between the English and the Afrikaners grew. National election brought the National Party to power in 1948. This party consisted mainly of Afrikaners. They lead the country into Apartheid. In 1961, South Africa became formally independent. The isolation caused by Apartheid contributed to separate South African English varieties, (e.g. Indian and Black) (Schneider 2007: 181-182).

The phase 4 (1994-) started when the non-violent “rainbow revolution” lead to free election in 1994 and Nelson Mandela. Full civil rights were given to all citizens. Emphasis was placed on a new collective national identity and multicultural society. There is, however, no local

variant of English that would be the carrier of this emerging national identity (Schneider 2007: 185).

Schneider (2011: 127) states that South Africa has two linguistic trends nowadays. The first is a trend towards multilingualism, where cultural hybridity is emphasized and English and African languages are mixed. The second trend is towards English, but: which English? South Africa has various Englishes; Indian, Black, Colored, White. Nevertheless, Schneider (2011: 127) says that “new linguistic accommodation processes are beginning to produce new, interracial compromise accents which ultimately may form the basis of an emerging new, more homogenous standard South African English”.

Schneider (2007: 184) also says that special characteristics are not that prominent in South African English as in other varieties, maybe due to the complex evolution conditions. However, special complementation structures are mentioned as an example of lexicogrammatical innovation, hence I am hoping to find some new, characteristically South African complementation patterns for *convince* as well.

5. Material and methods

This chapter introduces the corpora, the data, and research approach used in this thesis. Also the search methods and the retrieving of the used tokens are explained in order to ensure that the study is repeatable.

5.1. Corpus linguistics

The research approach of this thesis is corpus linguistics. According to Biber (2010: 159), corpus linguistics can be seen as an empirical, methodological approach that uses the actual patterns of use in natural language using corpora as the basis of analysis. Corpora are collections of natural texts and they are analyzed with computers. Corpus linguistics “depends on both quantitative and qualitative analytical techniques” (ibid. 160) and is used to “support empirical investigations of language variation and use” (ibid. 159). In order for the corpus to be representative, it needs to be large enough to represent an accurate distribution of linguistic features and the texts must be deliberately chosen (Biber 2010: 162). Biber notes that the goal of corpus linguistics is not to find new linguistic features but to discover the systematic patterns of use (2010: 163). The strengths of corpus-based approach are high reliability and external validity, and the findings are often surprising and against intuitions, showing that intuitions about use are often faulty (ibid. 163, 167). Corpus linguistic studies have shown that in different registers almost any linguistic variant or feature can be used in dramatically different ways (Biber 2010: 163).

When the used corpora have different amount of words, in order to be able to compare the corpora, the raw numbers cannot be compared. The raw counts do not give accurate accounts of the relative frequencies (Biber et al. 1998: 263). This is solved by normalizing the frequencies, which means that the raw frequency counts are adjusted so that they can be compared. The formula

for this is: (raw frequency count / number of words in the text) x basis chosen for norming (e.g. per MIL) (Biber et al. 1998: 263).

For this thesis, normalizing the frequencies is not needed, however. Although I will use four subcorpora, all of which have different amount of words, the sample size is the same for all corpora, 300 tokens. This means that I can compare for example which complement pattern is the most common in different corpora by just using the raw numbers. Normalized frequencies are only used to find out whether the verb is equally represented in all the subcorpora (Table 3).

5.2. Linguistic patterns

The aim of this thesis is to study patterns. Hunston (2002: 169,173) talks about why patterns are important and why it is useful to study them. She defines ‘pattern’ as “a sequence of grammar words, word types or clause types which co-occur with a given lexical item. An item may be said to control or ‘have’ a pattern if the pattern occurs frequently and is dependent on the item in question” (Hunston 2002: 169). According to Hunston, a pattern is not only an important concept in language teaching but they are also important in language production, in accuracy and fluency (2002: 169,173). Also when studying variation, patterns are a significant aspect (Hunston 2002: 181). Hunston states that “[d]ifferent geographical varieties of English have in some cases different pattern-word combinations” (2002: 174) Thus, it is possible to have different patterns in different varieties and it is interesting to see whether this is true with the complement patterns of the varieties selected for this thesis.

5.3. The Corpus of Global Web-Based English

All the data comes from the Corpus of Global Web-Based English, GloWbE. It contains about 1.9 billion words from twenty different countries. Because of the large size of the corpus and the ability to search within different varieties of English, this corpus is selected to be used in this thesis. The texts in the corpus are from the Internet, either general web pages or blogs. The texts were collected in December 2012. The subcorpora of Great Britain, New Zealand, Malaysia, and South Africa were used.

The tokens were retrieved using search string [convince].[v*]. This string searches for all the verb forms of *convince* (*convince*, *convinced*, *convincing*, *convinces*). Each subcorpus was searched separately. There were too many results for each variety, so the amount of tokens was thinned. The sample of 500 tokens was selected from the results and the first 300 hits were selected as the data. These tokens were not in alphabetical order but a random sample. This was done to all the varieties, resulting in 1200 tokens in total, 300 tokens per variety.

Table 3 shows all the subcorpora and how many words there are in each of them. Also the numbers of hits of *convince* in each subcorpus is listed. The fourth column shows how common the verb is in all the subcorpora. In order to find out if the verb is as common in all the subcorpora, the raw frequencies need to be normalized. The normalized results are rounded to the nearest integer.

The normalized frequencies show that *convince* is a bit more common in Great Britain than in the other varieties. Among the other three varieties, it is almost as common. The difference between the varieties is very little so it could be said that *convince* is equally represented in all the subcorpora.

Table 3. *Convince* in different subcorpora.

Variety	The total number of words in subcorpus	Raw number of hits in subcorpus	Norm. freq. PER MIL (N / 1 000 000 words)
Great Britain	387,615,074	convince 8062 convinced 6732 convincing 821 convinces 380 total 15997	41
New Zealand	81,390,476	convince 1566 convinced 1124 convincing 167 convinces 69 total 2926	36
Malaysia	42,420,168	convince 895 convinced 461 convincing 79 convinces 26 total 1461	34
South Africa	45,364,498	convince 859 convinced 603 convincing 78 convinces 34 total 1574	35

6. Analysis of data

In this chapter the data from GloWbE is introduced and corpus findings are analysed. Examples of usage of each variety and pattern are given. Examples of excluded tokens are also given.

When analyzing the tokens, I will keep in mind my research questions and some other questions that are relevant. I will pay attention to for example these factors and questions when analyzing:

- Do the Complexity Principle, *horror aequi*, and extractions affect or appear in my data?
- Are there new patterns in my data, patterns that were not mentioned in the dictionaries?
- What are the most common patterns in different varieties? Are they same or different? What could be the reason for differences/similarities?
- Do the new postcolonial varieties select more or fewer patterns than British English?
- What patterns appear in the British English but not in the other varieties?
- Do the other varieties have some patterns that do not appear in the British English?
- The Dynamic Model – does the phase of the varieties affect the results? If so, how is it visible in the data? (The hypothesis was that first old and new forms are used, and then later new forms are preferred).

These are discussed in chapters 6 and 7.

6.1. Excluded tokens

As mentioned, some tokens are excluded from the data and not analysed further. There were altogether 226 tokens that were set aside, but I will give some examples of them. Most of the excluded tokens were adjectivals. Also some other tokens were excluded, and here is an example of those cases as well.

There are some rules I used to decide whether a pattern is dynamic or stative/adjectival. Like mentioned before, dynamic passives describe an action and stative passives describe a state. Also, if the sentence has a *by*-phrase with a personal agent, it is dynamic. If premodification is possible with the intensifier *very*, it is stative/adjectival and excluded from the analysis as stated above.

(1) He however was convinced by his friends to join the RMNVR... (Malaysia utuhpaloi.com)

Sentence (1) is an example of a sentence that may look like an adjectival at first but actually it is not. It is included in the study because it is a dynamic passive: it has a *by*-phrase with a personal agent and the corresponding active is *His friends convinced him to join the RMNVR...* The complement here is [+NP+*to*-infinitive]. Sentences (2), (3), and (4), however, are examples of excluded tokens.

(2) After finishing my plate of Char Koay Teow, I was convinced that I came to the right place. (Malaysia foodnframe.com)

(3) Like all parents, we are convinced our little girl is both bright and beautiful but...(New Zealand stuff.co.nz)

(4) You cant walk into a convince store and just grab a coke...(Great Britain positech.co.uk)

In sentences (2) and (3), *convince* is an adjectival. These tokens are excluded because they are adjectivals describing a state and not verbal describing an action. It is also possible to use a premodification with the intensifier *very* which shows that these are adjectivals. Sentence *we are very convinced that our girl is both bright and beautiful* shows that this token is indeed an adjectival and thus, excluded. Example (4) is an example of a sentence that was excluded because *convince* was not used as a verb nor as an adjective but it was most likely just a mistake, a typo, and it should be a *convenience store* instead.

There are some unclear cases. In some cases it was difficult to decide whether *convince* was used as a verb or as an adjective, for example sentence (5). As the agent phrase is

usually left unexpressed, as mentioned previously, it makes sentences like (5) hard to analyse: is there an unexpressed agent phrase, or is the sentence just adjectival?

(5) Many suicide bombers are convinced their families will be killed if they do not accomplish their mission. (Great Britain newscientist.com)

Sentence (5) could be dynamic passive, and corresponding active would be *someone convinced many suicide bombers their families will be killed*, when the complement would be [+NP+that-clause], *that* omitted. But this case could also be adjectival, because premodification with *very* is possible: *many suicide bombers are very convinced that their families will be killed*.

In these kinds of cases I have tried to identify the pattern according to state vs action. But sometimes I have not been sure about the right answer so I have analysed those tokens as unclear. Note that unclear cases are not excluded from the study. They are just marked as ‘unclear’ in the tables and they are included. Sentences (6) and (7) are also examples of unclear cases.

(6) Within three minutes Michele had him convinced to take a photo. (South Africa ...rg.myfotojournal.com)

(7) ...and decided to finish online myself BUT my parents took a very long time to convince they finally understood and let me. (New Zealand nz.answers.yahoo.com)

Sentence (6) *has someone had someone convinced* –construction that occurs in some other varieties as well. Is this adjectival or not? I have labeled these as unclear.

Sentence (7) is labeled as unclear as well. Is the sentence (7) a *that*-clause where *that* is omitted? Or is it in dynamic passive, when the corresponding active would be *It took a very long time to convince my parents they finally understood and let me*. Then this sentence would be [+NP+that-clause], *that* omitted. But *to convince parents that they finally understood* sounds really odd. Another possibility is that there is a mistake in this sentence.

All in all, 226 tokens of 1200 were set aside, 64 from Great Britain, 53 from New Zealand, 44 from Malaysia, and 65 from South Africa. This means that the final number of included tokens is 236 for Great Britain, 247 for New Zealand, 256 for Malaysia, and 235 for South Africa.

6.2. Corpus findings

In this subchapter, I will first give examples of dynamic passives in the data and discuss the factors that may have affected the data: extractions, Complexity Principle, and *horror aequi*. Then I will introduce the complement patterns found in different varieties.

Many of the tokens in the data were in dynamic passive. These I changed into corresponding actives to be able to see the pattern.

(8a) Your parents need to be convinced to come and watch you play. (Great Britain thezimbabwean.co.uk)

(8b) Someone needs to convince your parents to come and watch you play.

(9a) A doubting Christian, and an unbelieving world will not be convinced by mere words. (New Zealand gospel.org.nz)

(9b) Mere words will not convince a doubting Christian, and an unbelieving world.

Sentences (8a) and (9a) are dynamic passives. Sentences (8b) and (9b) are the corresponding actives. The dynamic passives were present in four different patterns: [+NP+*that*-clause], [+NP+*to*-infinitive], [+NP], and [+NP+*of*+NP] (the four most common patterns). Dynamic passives appeared in all the varieties, in Great Britain 9.7% of the tokens, in New Zealand 8.1%, in Malaysia 5.5%, and in South Africa 6.8% of the tokens were in dynamic passive. These numbers correspond with the phase of the variety: Great Britain, which is the oldest variety, had the most, and Malaysia, the youngest variety, the least.

The Complexity Principle was mostly followed in the data. Some examples where the principle is followed are given here as examples. Cases where the principle was violated were not many, but here is the one example that was found in the data.

If a complexity factor, like long subject or discontinuous or passive construction, is used in a sentence with an implicit option, the Complexity Principle is violated. Like mentioned in 2.3., according to the principle, in an environment with a complexity factor, an explicit option should be used instead (for example using *that* instead of omitting it). Sentence (10) is an example

of a case where the Complexity Principle is followed. A complexity factor, passive construction (dynamic passive), is used in the sentence with an explicit option, *that*, as the principle goes.

(10) Others were convinced by Madison that different factions would come together until they formed a majority” (New Zealand guerillamedia.co.nz)

(11) Sebastian convinced us it (-) would be worth the extra effort. (New Zealand activeadventurers.com)

(12) However a close reading of the Proposed Staffing Re-alignment Report has convinced me (-) there is no intention of replacing Cameron. (New Zealand, swimwatch.net)

Sentences (11) and (12) are both examples of pattern [+NP+*that*-clause] where *that* is omitted. In sentence (11), the implicit option, *that* omitted, is used, but there is no complexity factor, hence the principle is not violated. This happened in most of the cases. In sentence (12), however, there is a long subject, which is a complexity factor and means that there is a complex environment, thus, according to the principle, the sentence should have the explicit option, *that*. The implicit option is used instead, thus the complexity principle is violated here.

Extractions occurred in my data to some extent. In Great Britain subcorpus, there were altogether only 3 extractions, which I think is quite a low number.

(13a) It is us you need to convince. (Great Britain sarahmcculloch.com)

(13b) You need to convince us.

If one only reads the sentence (13a), it would seem that the complement pattern is zero, but it is not. There is an extraction in the sentence (13a) and the complement can be seen in the sentence (13b). The complement here is a noun phrase *us*. There were 3 extractions in Malaysia and 1 in South Africa. New Zealand had the most, 9 extractions, here is one example:

(14a) Secondly, who is he trying to convince that National would cut Police numbers. (New Zealand ...impost.wordpress.com)

(14b) He is trying to convince WHO that National would cut Police numbers.

Like mentioned in 2.5., extractions can occur with *wh*-questions, topicalized sentences, and relative clauses. This is an example of extraction that occurs with *wh*-question.

Horror aequi, the tendency to avoid two similar structures, was violated but only in few cases. In sentence (19) *horror aequi* was followed, in tokens (15), (16), (17), and (18) it was

clearly violated. Adjacent or near *to*-infinitives and *ofs* were found in many sentences. These were the only constructions that seemed to violate the *horror aequi*.

(15) The other way is to convince foreigners to invest in other things. (New Zealand werewolf.co.nz)

(16) ... occurrences that gave rise to the Missile Crisis in October 1962, which convinced the organizers of the inevitability of a direct military intervention by the U.S. army... (Great Britain ...acus.schoolnet.co.uk)

(17) After weeks of negotiating, Tara is finally able to convince Otto to drop his RICO testimony against the club. (Great Britain whatculture.com)

(18) the 1SG is, of course, going to try to convince you to stay the course. (Malaysia ...ndgovernment.blog.my)

In sentences (15) and (17), there are two *to*-infinitives near each other. In sentence (18), there are not two but even three *to*-infinitives. If *horror aequi* had been followed here, the double and triple *to*-infinitives would have been avoided. But, as mentioned, this is not a rule but just a tendency. In sentence (16), two near *ofs* appear.

There was one token where *horror aequi* clearly did affect the choice of complement. These cases were not many, however, only one, and I would have expected to find more sentences where it is seen that *horror aequi* affects the pattern. In sentence (19), it is clear that similar structures are avoided and the pattern is chosen according to the tendency.

(19) Columbus had to convince the European scientists of his day *about* the size of the world (New Zealand 1421exposed.com)

Complement pattern in (19) is [+NP+*about*+NP]. This pattern is mentioned in the dictionaries, but instead of this pattern, this sentence could also have used the pattern [+NP+*of*+NP], which is more common. There are, however, already two *ofs*, so according to the *horror aequi* principle, *about* is used instead of the third *of*.

(20) ... and you're going to convince yourself it's not that important. (New Zealand hypno.co.nz)

In the interesting example (20), the complement pattern is [+NP+*that*-clause] where *that* is omitted. This could be a case of *horror aequi* principle, tendency to avoid two grammatical elements near each other. There is already another *that* so it could be that the relative *that* is omitted because of

that. However, the *thats* in this sentence do not have the same function. That would mean that this is not, after all, an example of *horror aequi*.

Next I will present four tables, one table for each variety and its complement patterns. The tables consist of complement patterns only, and no adjuncts are mentioned. Adjuncts are excluded from further consideration. However, there were adjuncts present in the data. Some tokens had both complement and adjunct. Like mentioned in 2.2., complements help to complete the meaning of the sentence but adjuncts only provide additional information. Adjuncts are optional and they could be omitted without loss of grammaticality. Here are some examples of tokens where both adjunct and complement are present.

(21) Nonetheless, try as I might, I could not convince **her** *otherwise*. (South Africa mg.co.za)

(22) It convinced **me even more** **that it is good to have people that inspire you**. (Great Britain thegirlinthecafe.com)

In example (21), the complement pattern is [+NP], *her*, and there is also an adjunct, *otherwise*. An adjunct, *even more*, is also present in the example (22). These sentences are grammatically good even if the adjuncts are omitted.

In these next four tables, the complement patterns and their number of occurrences in each subcorpus are listed. Also, for each pattern, in each subcorpus separately, I will give the percentage. This number will tell how common the pattern is in its subcorpus. (E.g. 50% of all the tokens in a subcorpus are pattern X.) The results are rounded to the nearest decimal. The percentage is taken from the amount where adjectivals and other non-relevant tokens have been excluded. This makes the sample size not 300 anymore, so every subcorpus has now a slightly different sample size, but normalizing frequencies is still not done because the numbers are so similar (i.e., 236, 247, 256, 235).

Table 4. Complement patterns in subcorpus Great Britain

Complement pattern	Number of occurrences	% (ca.)
NP+<i>that</i>-clause with <i>that</i> <i>that</i> omitted of which dynamic passives	112 83 (ca. 74%) 29 (ca. 26%) 5	47.4
NP+<i>to</i>-infinitive of which dynamic passives	52 2	22.0
NP of which dynamic passives of which extractions	44 15 2	18.6
NP+<i>of</i>+NP of which dynamic passives of which extractions	21 1 1	8.9
NP+<i>wh</i>-clause	3	1.3
unclear	2	0.8
zero	2	0.8
excluded adjectival other	64 59 5	
Total number of analysed tokens	300	
Number of analysed tokens without excluded	236	100

Table 5. Complement patterns in subcorpus New Zealand

Complement pattern	Number of occurrences	% (ca.)
NP+<i>that</i>-clause with <i>that</i> <i>that</i> omitted	121 93 (ca. 77%) 28 (ca. 23%)	49.0

of which dynamic passives	8	
of which extractions with <i>that</i> <i>that omitted</i>	3 2 1	
NP+to-infinitive	66	26.7
of which dynamic passives of which extractions	5 1	
NP	36	14.6
of which dynamic passives of which extractions	7 4	
NP+of+NP	15	6.1
of which extractions	1	
unclear	4	1.6
that-clause	1	0.4
NP+about+NP	2	0.8
NP+wh-clause	1	0.4
zero	1	0.4
excluded	53	
adjectival other	50 3	
Total number of analysed tokens	300	
Number of analysed tokens without excluded	247	100

Table 6. Complement patterns in subcorpus Malaysia

Complement pattern	Number of occurrences	% (ca.)
NP+that-clause with <i>that</i> <i>that omitted</i>	115 105 (ca. 91%) 10 (ca. 9%)	45.0
of which dynamic passives of which extractions (<i>that</i> omitted)	4 1	
NP+to-infinitive	79	30.9
of which dynamic passives	6	

NP	39	15.2
of which dynamic passives	4	
of which extractions	1	
NP+<i>of</i>+NP	10	3.9
of which dynamic passives	1	
NP+<i>wh</i>-clause	2	0.8
NP+<i>on</i>+NP	4	1.6
of which extractions	1	
zero	2	0.8
NP+<i>ing</i>-clause	1	0.4
<i>that</i>-clause	1	0.4
NP+<i>about</i>+NP	1	0.4
unclear	1	0.4
NP+<i>about</i>+<i>wh</i>-clause	1	0.4
excluded	44	
adjectival	44	
Total number of analysed tokens	300	
Number of analysed tokens without excluded	256	100

Table 7. Complement patterns in subcorpus South Africa

Complement pattern	Number of occurrences	% (ca.)
NP+<i>that</i>-clause	90	38.3
with <i>that</i>	77 (ca. 86%)	
<i>that</i> omitted	13 (ca. 14%)	
of which dynamic passives	9	
of which extractions	1	
NP+<i>to</i>-infinitive	86	36.6
of which dynamic passives	1	
<i>to</i> omitted	1	
NP	28	11.9
of which dynamic passives	5	

NP+of+NP	16	6.8
of which dynamic passives	1	
unclear	4	1.7
NP+wh-clause	3	1.3
NP+about+wh-clause	2	0.9
that-clause	2	0.9
NP+about+NP	1	0.4
NP+of+wh-clause	1	0.4
zero	1	0.4
excluded	65	
adjectival	64	
other	1	
Total number of analysed tokens	300	
Number of analysed tokens without excluded	235	100

In Table 8, I have listed all the patterns that were found in the different varieties and also what were found in the dictionaries.

Table 8. Patterns found.

Pattern	GB	NZ	MY	ZA	Dictionaries
NP+that-clause	x	x	x	x	x
NP+to-infinitive	x	x	x	x	x
NP	x	x	x	x	x
NP+of+NP	x	x	x	x	x
NP+wh-clause	x	x	x	x	x
zero	x	x	x	x	

<i>that</i> -clause		x	x	x	
NP+ <i>about</i> +NP		x	x	x	x
NP+ <i>ing</i> -clause			x		
NP+ <i>on</i> +NP			x		
NP+ <i>about</i> + <i>wh</i> -clause			x	x	
<i>of</i> +NP					x
NP+ <i>of</i> + <i>wh</i> -clause				x	x
Number of different patterns in a subcorpus	6	8	11	10	

All in all, 12 patterns were found in the data, 5 of which were new and 7 of which were found in the dictionaries. One pattern found in the dictionaries was not present in the data.

Most of these patterns found in the data (all except [+NP], [+zero], and [+*that*-clause] complements) include two complements, like [+NP+*that*-clause], which consists of [+NP] and [+*that*-clause] complements. It is also worth mentioning that almost all of these patterns found in the data include an NP (excluding zero and *that*-clause complements) and in all patterns the NP is the first part of the complement structure of *convince* (in [+*of*+NP] it is not but that pattern was not present in the data).

Next, all patterns are discussed separately and examples of each are given. I will also compare how common they are, where they occur, what kind of sentences they are, and give possibly some other remarks.

6.3. Patterns found in the dictionaries

First, here are listed those patterns that appear in the dictionaries and also at least once in some or all varieties.

6.3.1. NP+*that*-clause

This was the most common pattern in all the varieties. Almost half of the tokens in every variety have this pattern: in Great Britain 47.4%, in New Zealand 49%, and in Malaysia 45%. In South Africa, it was a little less common than in the others, 38.3%.

Here are two basic examples where pattern [+NP+*that*-clause] is used.

(23) It took me a long time to convince people **that** there is a future in being creative in Asia ... (Malaysia limkokwing.net)

(24) He convinces himself **that** his new treatment plan is working. (South Africa runnersworld.co.za)

This pattern can occur either with *that* complementizer, as in sentences (23) and (24), or it can be omitted. In British English and New Zealand English, *that* was omitted more, about in one fourth of the cases. In Malaysia and South Africa, *that* was omitted clearly less, in 9% and in 14% of the cases respectively. As Great Britain and New Zealand are older Englishes and they omit *that* more than Malaysia and South Africa, which are in earlier phases, it could be possible that the phase affects the results. As Mesthrie (2008: 494) mentions, the Black South African English prefers overt expressions of complementizers like *that*. I do not know which South African English the tokens represent but this could be one reason why South African subcorpus has omitted *that* less than Great Britain and New Zealand.

Here are two sentences where *that* is omitted.

(25) So sure of their supremacy ... they convinced themselves (-) a patronising word or two to the masses would bring us into line. (New Zealand thestandard.org.nz)

(26) ... but it is not the only company hoping to convince the world (-) its operating system will open up opportunities... (Great Britain news.techeye.net)

It is not surprising that this pattern was the most common pattern in the data. In the *OED*, it is in the top three of most used patterns. As mentioned before in 2.1., Biber et al. note that *that*-clauses and *to*-infinitive clauses, which was the second most used pattern in my data, are more than twice as

common as for example *wh*-clauses. (In my data, *wh*-clauses were even less common compared to these two patterns, as only about 1% in each variety was *wh*-clause.)

6.3.2. NP+*to*-infinitive-clause

This pattern was the second most used pattern in all the varieties. Also in the *OED* this is in the top three of most used patterns. South Africa had less [+NP+*that*-clause] patterns than the others, now it has more of this pattern, 36.6%, while the others have 22.0% (Great Britain), 26.7% (New Zealand), and 30.9% (Malaysia).

(27) He is doing it to try and convince the judge to give him a shorter jail sentence. (Great Britain ...istotalessex.co.uk)

(28) Despite knowing I was being silly, it did take me a while to convince myself not to get creeped out about the darkness and what lay beyond it. (New Zealand tandemturners.com)

(29) I will keep trying to convince her to keep the cat (Malaysia forums.petfinder.my)

Sentence (27) is a basic example and (28) is an interesting negative. Sentence (27) also shows how this pattern is used with the sense ‘to persuade’ (the *OED* sense 3f). *To*-infinitive construction can be used to express intentionality and future-oriented volition or future goal (Smith and Escobedo 2001: 553). The sentence (27) also expresses intentionality and future goal. As noted earlier, Biber et al. also mention that *to*-infinitive clauses are usually used to report for example speech and intention. Intention is seen in example (29).

(30) ... and few experimental Muggle flies and heading down the road to see if I could convince one of them eat my latest guesswork of fur and feather. (South Africa ...eathersandfluoro.co)

Sentence (30) is a great example. I analysed the complement as [+NP+*to*-infinitive], but it seems that *to* is omitted here. This was the only token where *to* seemed to be omitted. What is the reason for this? Is this a mistake or just simplification, a common way of Postcolonial Englishes to create new uses? As Schneider (2007: 89) mentions, many features in Postcolonial Englishes can

be examples of simplification, like omitting. It is also possible that this is a case where the less explicit feature, the bare infinitive, is used instead of the *to*-infinitive.

6.3.3. NP

Pattern [+NP] was one of the few patterns that included only one complement, an NP that was functioning as the object to the verb *convince*. This NP could be for example a pronoun, as in (31), or a long noun phrase as in (32), or a short noun phrase, just an article and a noun as in (33), or a proper noun as in (34). Pronoun was the most common noun phrase used with this pattern.

(31) She had convinced me. (Malaysia booksie.com)

(32) ...the information that these souls could provide could easily convince even the most skeptical of us. (New Zealand sillybeliefs.com)

(33) I sensed an opportunity to convince my husband. (New Zealand travelfreak.net)

(34) I manage to convince Joe too hehehe (Malaysia myweyoflife.com)

(35) 'The Nation' does though not convince me as being such a great current affairs show, as too many reports and... (New Zealand ...anedwardsmedia.co.nz)

Sentence (35) is an interesting example. The pattern is [+NP], although it seems that it could be [+NP+*as*]. However, the prepositional phrase “as being...” modifies the word “The Nation” and not the verb.

[+NP] was the third used pattern in every variety in my data, and in the *OED* it was in the top three as well. In my data it was the most common in Great Britain with 18.6% and the least common in South Africa, with 11.9%.

6.3.4. NP+*of*+NP

In all the data, [+NP+*of*+NP] was the fourth most common pattern. Less than 10% of patterns in each variety had this pattern. It was the most common in Great Britain with 8.9% and the least common in Malaysia with 3.9%.

(36) Your bank or lender will need to be convinced of the viability of your business, or your business expansion. (Malaysia whyfranchising.com)

(37) ... and in any case you are there to convince people of your point of view. (Great Britain businessblogging.com)

Collins Cobuild English Language Dictionary mentioned that in the [+NP+of+NP] sequence, the meaning of the verb is 'assure'. This was found in my data as well, in example (36). That sentence is in dynamic passive and the corresponding active is *Someone/You will need to convince your bank or lender of the viability of your business, or your business expansion*. The meaning of *convince* in that sentence is clearly 'assure'.

Here is an interesting token that was found in the Great Britain subcorpus.

(38) ..the two atomic bombs in 1945 and the Sputnik in 1957 should convince every sensible person on earth the high achievement of science... (Great Britain pantaneto.co.uk)

It seems that the complement pattern in this sentence is [+NP+of+NP], in which *of* seems to be omitted. Is this really the case and is this really a pattern, or can this be a mistake? Is the *of* omitted on accident because of the second *of* that follows *achievement*? Or is it omitted on purpose? If so, this could be an example of *horror aequi* but this sentence really does not seem to be grammatical. As this seems ungrammatical and has only one occurrence, I decided this to be a mistake, and not a pattern where *of* is omitted on purpose. It is analyzed as [+NP+of+NP].

6.3.5. NP+wh-clause

[+NP+wh-clause] was mentioned in the dictionaries (not in the *OED* but in another one), but it had very few occurrences in my data. Based on its inclusion in dictionaries, I would have expected more hits of this pattern. This pattern had altogether 9 occurrences although this is the fifth popular pattern (fourth pattern [+NP+of+NP] had 62 occurrences).

(39) When you go abroad, to start with, you must be able to convince your employers why you deserve that post over their own grads (Malaysia pagalavan.com)

(40) But to convince us how fallacious this reasoning is, we need only consider...
(Great Britain davidhume.org)

In sentence (39), the *wh*-word is *why* and in (40), *how*.

6.3.6. NP+*about*+NP

This pattern was not found in British English, but it appears in all the other varieties and in the dictionaries as well. In the three postcolonial varieties, it was not a common pattern at all; only 2 occurrences in New Zealand, 1 in Malaysia, and 1 in South Africa.

(41) Maryanne taught me for several years, and I unashamedly admit that she has convinced me about these matters. (New Zealand ...isprettyawesome.com)

(42) To lead the way, academic must convince the politicians about the potential benefits of open access to the current and future generations (South Africa blogs.sun.ac.za)

It seems that instead of this pattern, pattern [+NP+*of*+NP] could be used. It could be interesting to see whether the use of the pattern [+NP+*about*+NP] increases in the future.

6.3.7. *of*+NP

There was only one pattern that was mentioned in the dictionaries but not in any of my data: [*of*+NP]. I searched the GloWbE again with search string '[convince].[v*] of'. I found some hits. (New Zealand 19, Malaysia 11, South Africa 11, Great Britain 124.) However, looking closely, it seems like most of these tokens are adjectivals or dynamic passives, so the complement pattern actually is not [+*of*+NP] but something else (e.g. [+NP+*of*+NP]) when the sentence is changed into a corresponding active.

6.3.8. NP+*of*+*wh*-clause

[+NP+*of*+*wh*-clause] was a very rare pattern. Although it was mentioned in the dictionaries, in the data it occurred only once in all the four varieties. The one occurrence was in South Africa.

(43) It's crazy what we can convince ourselves of in the face of loss. (South Africa tertia.org)

One detail worth noting is that the example (43) also involves extraction (“we can convince ourselves of what...”).

6.4. New patterns

As can be seen in Table 8, there are new patterns in use in the varieties that were not present in the dictionaries. I will list these patterns here and discuss each one separately.

6.4.1. zero

Huddleston and Pullum (2002: 216) talk about the transitivity of verbs, meaning how many objects a verb can have. Intransitive verbs do not have objects, for example *I fainted*, but transitive do, for example *They destroyed all the evidence* (ibid.). Transitive verbs can be divided into subclasses: monotransitive (one object) and ditransitive (two objects). They also mention that there are many verbs that can be both transitive and intransitive, like *read*: *She read* / *She read the letter* are examples of intransitive (no object) and transitive (one object) use of verb *read* (2002: 216). These are called dual-transitivity verbs (Huddleston and Pullum 2002: 217). *Convince* is a transitive verb because it licences an object. It seems that *convince* can be both monotransitive, like in *I convinced him*, or ditransitive, like in *I convinced him to come*. In the first sentence, the complement is [+NP] and in the second sentence, the complements are [+NP] and [+*to*-infinitive], hence the pattern is

[+NP+to-infinitive-clause]. The result according to my data is that this ditransitive complementation is more popular for *convince*. In the *OED* examples, *convince* is always used with an object, it does not appear without a complement, meaning that it is not an intransitive verb. However, in my data there are examples of tokens which do not have any complements, tokens that look like they have a zero complement, tokens that use *convince* as though it were a dual-transitive verb. These tokens are marked as [+zero] pattern.

This was a really difficult pattern to analyse. It occurred in every variety, though not in the dictionaries. The pattern appears once in Great Britain, New Zealand, and South Africa, and twice in Malaysia.

(44) It is to convince: to present a case that so effectively marries logic and language with emotion and ... (South Africa inside-politics.org)

(45) Just read Ian Wishart's " Air Con " book and it will readily convince! (New Zealand nzcpr.com)

(46) ...the main character's accents don't convince. (Great Britain ...enorthnireland.org)

(47) Torres still fails to convince as the apex of the Chelsea attack... (Great Britain ...eurosport.yahoo.com)

Convince who? Convince what? Sentence (46) seems ungrammatical without any complement. It is unclear whether all these tokens really are examples of zero complement, a new pattern, or are they something else, like extractions or ellipted complements. Huddleston and Pullum (2002: 1528) tell that with *convince*, it is possible to use an ellipted complement. When discussing the ellipsis of finite complements, they offer an example sentence "I suggested the price was too high, and she agreed _ ." and even though this sentence looks like the verb *agree* has a zero complement, it is not the case: the sentence is interpreted as "she agreed that the price was too high" with a declarative complement. *Convince* is one of these verbs that can take this kind of ellipsis. The ellipted complement clause can be understood as either declarative or interrogative (ibid.). With *convince*, the complement is understood as declarative (Huddleston and Pullum 2002: 1529).

Sentence (47) is an interesting example: at first it seems that the pattern should be [+as+NP], but this is not the case. This structure occurred only in the Great Britain subcorpus and

nowhere else. This sentence is analyzed as [+zero], because the prepositional phrase “as the apex...” that follows the verb *convince* seems to be more connected to the subject, “Torres”, and not to the verb *convince*. The [+zero] pattern is visible if the sentence is rephrased as “Torres as the apex of the Chelsea attack still fails to convince”.

These sentences seem ungrammatical, because the object seems to be left out. Maybe the objects are left out because the understood objects are very broad, like “the reader” in (45) or “the audience” in (46). Even though these sentences seem ungrammatical, zero is listed here as its own pattern. It could be possible that it is a new, innovative pattern for *convince*, a pattern that may have spread to be used with *convince* as well, as it is possible to use zero with some other verbs.

6.4.2. *that*-clause

This pattern appears in all three new Postcolonial Englishes, but not in Great Britain or in any of the dictionaries. South Africa had 2, Malaysia 1, and New Zealand 2 occurrences. With such small occurrence numbers, it has to be considered whether this indeed is its own new pattern and not just a mistake.

(48) If we want to play in the Champions League we have to convince *that* we are going to last by winning the league with maximum points, so... (South Africa orlandopiratesfc.com)

(49) I know nothing and it was not necessary therefor to gather evidence to come and convince *that* I did not do any thing. (South Africa justice.gov.za)

(50) ...trying to convince the viewers that they had a great holiday (here trying to convince *that* the wing was a success). (New Zealand vsail.info)

Considering that this pattern occurs more than once and in more than one variety, I would presume that it is indeed a new real pattern, an example that Postcolonial Englishes can be innovative and produce new innovative patterns. This could be an example of simplification, omission, as it seems that the usual NP complement is omitted.

It seems that the NP is omitted in these cases because it is evident or broad, as was the case with [+zero] pattern. In sentence (50), the object, “the readers”, is already mentioned in the sentence previously, so perhaps it is omitted because it is obvious that the object is still the same.

6.4.3. NP+*ing*-clause

[+NP+*ing*-clause] is a pattern that occurs only in Malaysia. It is not mentioned in the dictionaries, and in the Malaysian data it occurs only once, hence, instead of being a new pattern, this could be a mistake.

(51) ... in their exclusive “ Monday Talk with TMT-INDIA “ found out the real person who convinced the Supreme court regarding the decision. (Malaysia ...alaysiantimes.com.my)

It seems that here, *ing*-clause is used instead of *to*-infinitive (“...who convinced the Supreme court to regard the decision”). Could this be characteristic for Malaysia? Baskaran (2008: 281) mentions that Malaysian English “shows sufficient influence from local languages as well as modifications by way of over-generalisation, simplification, omission, etc. that have become fossilized enough to be recognizably Malaysian” thus, it is possible that although *ing*-clause is not present in anywhere else, Malaysian English has started to use it with *convince*.

I tried to search the GloWbE corpus again to find some evidence for or against this pattern. Using the search string ‘[convince].[v*] [p*] [v?g*]’ (string searches for constructions like *convince her saying*) and searching the whole corpus I found 6 hits in Great Britain and 1 hit in South Africa, but they were all irrelevant, for example *Immediately I contacted the dealer but he tried to convince me saying I hadn’t set it up correctly* (Great Britain pinkfishmedia.net), sentences where the *ing*-clause was not a part of the complement.

Considering that I did not find any other occurrences of [+NP+*ing*] pattern and in the data it occurred only once, I think that instead of being a new pattern, this could be a mistake. It is

listed as a pattern, though. Another explanation for this sentence could be that the sentence can also be interpreted as “who convinced the Supreme Court as regards the decision”. In that case, the complement pattern would be just [+NP].

6.4.4. NP+*on*+NP

[+NP+*on*+NP] could be a new Malaysian pattern. This is not mentioned in the dictionaries, and Malaysia is the only variety where this pattern occurs. It occurs four times so likely it is not just a mistake.

(52) ...which also caused the original 80-200mm f4.0 a little difficult to convince on new buyers. (Malaysia mir.com.my)

(53) The agent, apart from convincing the client on the 1 st investment, must also advice and inform the client of... (Malaysia irwan.my)

(54) Convince the future employer on your competency and capability to perform the job. (Malaysia graduan2u.com)

(55) Thus, the writer has to convince the readers on his or her own stance by giving relevant arguments. (Malaysia ...ive-essay-topics.com)

In the first example there is an extraction: “It was a little difficult to convince the original on new buyers”. [+NP+*on*+NP] is visible here.

6.4.5. NP+*about*+*wh*-clause

The pattern [+NP+*about*+*wh*-clause] occurred only once in Malaysia and twice in South Africa.

(56) We still have to convince the people about what it is that we can do. (Malaysia thesundaily.my)

Since this pattern occurred more than once and in more than one variety, it would be safe to say that this is indeed a new pattern.

As patterns [+NP+*about*+NP] and [+NP+*of*+NP] are both used with *convince* and they are found in the dictionaries, maybe this new pattern takes after the pattern [+NP+*of*+*wh*-clause]: maybe [+NP+*about*+*wh*-clause] is some sort of overgeneralization or process of continuity.

7. Discussion

This chapter discusses the patterns and their usages, compares the varieties, and offers some speculations to the research questions and questions presented previously.

Table 9. The total amount of different patterns.

Pattern	Great Britain	New Zealand	Malaysia	South Africa	TOTAL
NP+ <i>that</i> -clause	112	121	115	90	438
NP+ <i>to</i> -inf.	52	66	79	86	283
NP	44	36	39	28	147
NP+ <i>of</i> +NP	21	15	10	16	62
NP+ <i>wh</i> -clause	3	1	2	3	9
zero	2	1	2	1	6
<i>that</i> -clause	-	1	1	2	4
NP+ <i>about</i> +NP	-	2	1	1	4
NP+ <i>on</i> +NP	-	-	4	-	4
NP+ <i>ing</i> -clause	-	-	1	-	1
NP+ <i>about</i> + <i>wh</i> -clause	-	-	1	2	3
NP+ <i>of</i> + <i>wh</i> -clause	-	-	-	1	1
unclear	2	4	1	4	11
excluded	64	53	44	65	226
included tokens	236	247	256	235	974

This table shows which are the most used patterns and least used patterns in all the varieties and their occurrences. Also the preferences within the whole data are shown. Pattern [+of+NP] is left out of the table because it did not appear in the data.

Table 9 shows that interestingly the four most popular complement patterns clearly appear in the data the most often. The occurrences of other patterns are less than 10 occurrences each. The four most popular patterns have in total $438+283+147+62=930$ occurrences. They take $930/974$ (where 974 is the amount of all included tokens) = 95% of all tokens. The other 10 patterns are left with 5%.

It seems that new patterns, those patterns that do not appear in the dictionaries, are not in wide use: [+zero] has 5 occurrences, [+that-clause] 4, [+NP+on+NP] 4, [+NP+ing-clause] 1, and [+NP+about+wh-clause] 3 occurrences. The numbers are total occurrences of the patterns in all the varieties. This is very different when compared to the most popular patterns [+NP+that-clause] and [+NP+to-infinitive-clause] which have altogether 438 and 283 occurrences respectively.

Also, some patterns that do appear in the dictionaries can have very few occurrences, for example [+NP+of+wh-clause] had only 1 occurrence in all four varieties total, although it is mentioned in the dictionaries. But otherwise the dictionary-patterns had many occurrences.

Table 10. Top 3 complement patterns in different subcorpora.

	Great Britain	New Zealand	Malaysia	South Africa
1. NP+that-clause	112	121	115	90
2. NP+to-infinitive	52	66	79	86
3. NP	44	36	39	28

As table 10 shows, top three complement patterns are the same in all the varieties. [+NP+that-clause] was the most common, [+NP+to-infinitive] second, and [+NP] was third most used pattern.

This was quite a surprise as I was expecting more varied results. As mentioned before, the most common patterns used in the *OED* illustrations were [+NP], [+NP+*that*-clause], and [+NP+*to*-infinitive], therefore, it was not surprising that exactly these three patterns are the most common patterns in the data as well.

One reason for the result that the top three complement patterns are the same could be what Schneider has said about grammar. He (Schneider 2007: 86) stated that “words fluctuate relatively easily, the grammar of a language tends to be much more stable and resistant to change”. Thus, even though there were no deviations in what is the most popular complement for *convince*, there could be in the future, as grammar is slow to change.

As Schneider has said, however, complementation is one of the structures that has changed and created new uses in Postcolonial Englishes. But in my study I did not find that many new patterns (of 12 found patterns 5 were new patterns, and some of the new patterns can be mistakes and not new patterns) or differences in the most used patterns in different varieties. This may possibly change in the future, as Schneider states grammar is stable and changes happen slowly. Where I did find differences, however, was the amount of patterns in use.

Even though the top three complement patterns are same in all the varieties, there are still some important differences between the varieties found in my data. The numbers of different patterns in use in different subcorpora are interesting. It seems that it has something to do with the phase of the variety: the older the phase of the variety, the fewer patterns it has in use.

Malaysia is in phase 3 in the Dynamic Model. It is the earliest of these varieties and it has the most patterns in use, 11. South Africa is in phase 4 and it has 10 patterns. New Zealand, the postcolonial variety that has developed the most and is in phase 5, has the least of the three postcolonial varieties, 8. Great Britain has the lowest amount of patterns in use, 6. Malaysia and South Africa have the biggest variety of patterns that are in use, 11 and 10 respectively. They are newer Englishes than New Zealand or Great Britain. New Zealand, on the other hand, has fewer

patterns in use. These results show that the amount of complement patterns is connected to the phase of the variety.

Could it be that because New Zealand is in a later phase in Schneider's Dynamic Model, it means that the variety's grammar has been established already and there are not so many choices in patterns as is in these new varieties, South Africa and Malaysia? They seem to have "more space to move"; different and new patterns can perhaps be used more freely, maybe because they do not have as established grammar as in New Zealand?

So the number of complement patterns in British English and Postcolonial Englishes is different, British English has fewer patterns in use than Postcolonial Englishes. Does the complementation differ between British English and postcolonial Englishes in some other ways, for example what patterns they have in use? Do the postcolonial varieties use the same patterns as British English? The results show that all the patterns that are in Great Britain are in other varieties as well. It can be said that the new varieties all use all the same patterns as in British English, and in addition, they have their own new patterns. But it seems that old patterns have not been discarded, or not even preferred, which could have been the case according to Schneider. Schneider (2007: 86) stated that in postcolonial varieties, the verbs would later prefer new structures. In my data new patterns are introduced to postcolonial varieties, patterns that do not appear in Great Britain, but they are not preferred. Quite the contrary, the new patterns have still quite low amounts of occurrences and the most popular patterns in Postcolonial Englishes are the same as in British English.

As mentioned, the results show that the postcolonial varieties have more patterns than Great Britain, and the new patterns are not widely used. The question is, are all of them really new patterns or are they just mistakes? Or can they be new patterns that have not become permanent or established? Especially patterns that appear only once in one variety: are those new patterns emerging or mistakes? For example in Malaysia there was a pattern [+NP+*ing*-clause] which had

only one occurrence. The question is, are these really new patterns or not? If there are only 1 or 2 occurrences of a certain pattern that does not appear in a dictionary, is it a new pattern or not? If there is more than one appearance of a pattern, it probably is a new pattern. Whether other people repeat it and it starts to spread, or whether it dies after a couple of usages, is not known. More data should be studied to find clearer answers.

I wanted to find out whether the varieties have some new patterns that are characteristic for a certain variety. New Zealand and South Africa do not have patterns that would appear exclusively just in their variety. Malaysian English has two, [+NP+*on*+NP] and [+NP+*ing*-clause], if those patterns that appear only once in one variety are seen as new patterns as well, and not just mistakes. I would have expected to find more patterns that are characteristic of some particular postcolonial variety, but it seems that the new patterns that appear in the data are mostly used in several varieties and not just in one. One reason for this could be that the new patterns spread from one variety to another, although this seems highly unlikely, considering that these varieties are situated in all around the world. Another explanation could be instead what Cook (2016: 35) says about the learning of a second language: he notes that learners make the same kind of mistakes, not depending on their first language. Thus, it could be possible that some of the new patterns have started as mistakes and those same mistakes have been made in several varieties, resulting in new patterns in many varieties, and not just in one. The mistakes could be transfer, or they could be something else as well. Cook (*ibid.*) mentions that the mistakes made by second language learners were previously just seen as transfer from their first language, but it cannot be transfer in all cases, because second language learners make similar mistakes even when they have different first languages.

Where do these new patterns come from? Some reasons have been discussed in the pattern sections already and in this chapter as well, but here, more reasons are listed. Schneider (2007: 89) talks about the possible explanations for the phenomena that are found in Postcolonial

Englishes. Many of them can be explained for example by second-language acquisition to some extent. Also simplification and overgeneralization can usually be the explanation for the features of Postcolonial Englishes. Schneider, however, mentions (ibid.) that although simplification may be the reason behind some features of Postcolonial Englishes, it does not mean that the overall language systems are simple, quite the contrary. Schneider (2007: 99-100) offers some other possible reasons for the new patterns in Postcolonial Englishes as well. These are for example processes of continuity (the transmission of English forms and elements; from Standard and non-Standard English), innovation (simplification, restructuring, exaptation, linguistic creativity), and contact (the selection and adoption of elements from different, competing systems). Substrate influence, influence from local languages, has also shaped the Postcolonial Englishes, especially Malaysian English: like mentioned earlier, Malaysian English is shaped by local languages in many ways.

The hypothesis that in earlier phases, there should be new patterns appearing, and in later phases, the new patterns should be preferred, was partly correct. Correct was that new patterns did appear in earlier phases; but contrary to the hypothesis, later phases did not prefer new patterns but same patterns as British English.

It could be interesting to compare these results (like what are the most popular complements) to some earlier results of British English, for example. In my Bachelor's thesis I studied *convince* in recent British English, using *the British National Corpus, BNC*. The data comes from the late twentieth century so it is a bit older corpus than GloWbE and the result was that the most common complement pattern was [+NP+*that*-clause], second most common was [+NP], third most common was [+NP+*of*+NP], leaving the [+NP+*to*-infinitive] as fourth most common.

It should be considered how reliable these results presented in this thesis are. For one, the corpus itself can contain mistakes. In one case, the same exact sentence appeared in two corpora. There was one token in Malaysian subcorpus which also occurred in Singaporean

subcorpus. It was adjectival so it was excluded from the study, but as I searched for more context in order to be able to find out the complement pattern, I noticed that this exactly same text was also in Singapore corpus. Thus, it is possible that some of the results are not specifically Malaysian or any other variety although it occurs in that subcorpus. The results may not be completely trusted.

(58) ...to impact is Aston Villa's Matthew Lowton, with only 2.04% of readers convinced despite his a stunning goal against Swansea at... (Malaysia and Singapore goal.com)

The origins of the writers are not known, so even though a sentence appears in for example Great Britain corpus, it does not guarantee that a British person has written the sentence. It could be a person from New Zealand, using a New Zealand pattern, and thus, distorting the results.

Also, the reliability can be affected by the human mistakes in analyzing the tokens. Some tokens could be interpreted as another pattern by some other person.

8. Conclusion

In this thesis, I have discussed the verb *convince* and its complements, using corpus data from GloWbE and earlier work like dictionaries and grammars. I discussed the concept of complementation in general and what kinds of factors affect complementation, and how complements differ from adjuncts. The topic World Englishes was also discussed and different varieties introduced.

The first research question where I hoped to find an answer to was what kind of complement patterns of the verb *convince* can be found in British English and in the postcolonial varieties of English examined here (New Zealand, Malaysia, and South Africa). The verb selects different structures as its complement and according to the *OED*, the most common complement patterns for *convince* are [+NP], [+NP+*that*-clause], and [+NP+*to*-infinitive]. These were also the most common complement patterns in my data, in all the varieties. Altogether 12 patterns were found in the data. The four most used patterns were [+NP+*that*-clause], [+NP+*to*-infinitive-clause], [+NP], and [+NP+*of*+NP]. An important result was that these four most used patterns take 95% of the tokens. 7 of these 12 patterns were mentioned in the dictionaries and 5 were new, innovative patterns (or mistakes). New patterns had only very few occurrences so old patterns proved to be more popular. There was one pattern that appeared in the dictionaries but not in the data.

The second research question was whether the complementation differs between British English and the postcolonial varieties. The answer to this is yes and no. The top three complement patterns in all the varieties are the same, hence, in that way the complementation does not differ. But the amount of patterns in use is different. Postcolonial Englishes use the same patterns as British English (there was one exception that was in British English but not in any of the Postcolonial Englishes) and they also have their own new patterns.

The third research question was: Can Schneider's Dynamic Model and the phase of the postcolonial variety explain the possible differences between the varieties? It turned out that the phase might affect the results, specifically the amount of complement patterns in use. It seems that the varieties that are in earlier phases have more patterns in use and British English, which is the oldest English, has fewest.

In conclusion, it can be said that variation is found in the complementation of *convince*. Even though the sample size of this thesis was not that big, I was glad to find results that the phase of the variety does indeed affect the complementation at least to some extent and that Postcolonial Englishes have invented some new patterns, although the new patterns are not in wide use. A small sample of tokens, only one verb, and only three Postcolonial Englishes were at the focus of this thesis. More varieties could be studied in the future in order to find out if the phase really affects complementation and how, and whether the new patterns found really are new patterns. Also, more verbs could be studied to support the results presented here. The effects that second language acquisition may have on patterns and substrate influence could be taken into consideration when analyzing the results as well.

9. Bibliography

- Baskaran, Loga. *Malaysian English: phonology*. pp. 278-291. In: Mesthrie, Rajend. editor. 2008. *Varieties of English 4. Africa, South and Southeast Asia*. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter.
- Baskaran, Loga. *Malaysian English: morphology and syntax*. pp. 610-623. In: Mesthrie, Rajend. editor. 2008. *Varieties of English 4. Africa, South and Southeast Asia*. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter.
- Biber, Douglas. 2010. "Corpus-based and corpus-driven analyses of language variation and use." In *The Oxford Handbook of Linguistic Analysis*, ed. Bernd Heine and Heiko Narrog, 159-177. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Biber, Douglas, Susan Conrad, Randi Reppen. 1998. *Corpus linguistics. Investigating language structure and use*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Biber, Douglas, Stig Johansson, Geoffrey Leech, Susan Conrad, and Edward Finegan. 1999. *Longman Grammar of Spoken and Written English*. Pearson Education Limited.
- Cook, Vivian. 2016. *Second Language Learning and Language Teaching*. Routledge: New York.
- Cowie, A.P. ed. 1989. *Oxford Advanced Learner's Dictionary*. Fourth edition. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Huang, James. 1997. *Introduction to Syntax*. Linguistic institute.

Huddleston, Rodney, Geoffrey K. Pullum. 2002. *The Cambridge Grammar of the English Language*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Hundt, Marianne, Jennifer Hay and Elizabeth Gordon. *New Zealand English: morphosyntax*. pp. 560-592. In: Kortmann, Bernd et al., eds. 2004. *A Handbook of Varieties of English: Volume 2: Morphology and Syntax*. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter.

Hunston, Susan. 2002. "Pattern grammar, language teaching, and linguistic variation. Applications of a corpus-driven grammar." In *Using Corpora to Explore Linguistic Variation*, eds. Randi Reppen, Susan M. Fitzmaurice, and Douglas Biber, 167-183. Amsterdam: John Benjamins Publishing Company.

Kortmann, Bernd and Clive Upton. *Introduction: Varieties of English in the British Isles*. pp. 25-33. In: Kortmann, Bernd et al., eds. 2004. *A Handbook of Varieties of English: Volume 2: Morphology and Syntax*. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter.

Mair, Christian. 2002. "Three changing patterns of verb complementation in Late Modern English: a real-time study based on matching text corpora" *English Language and Linguistics*. 6.1: 105-131. Cambridge University Press.

Mesthrie, Rajend. *Black South African English: morphology and syntax*. pp. 488-500. In: Mesthrie, Rajend. editor. 2008. *Varieties of English 4. Africa, South and Southeast Asia*. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter.

Mesthrie, Rajend and Rakesh M. Bhatt. 2008. *World Englishes. The Study of New Linguistic Varieties*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Perlmutter, David M. and Scott Soames. 1979. *Syntactic Argumentation and the Structure of English*. Berkeley: University of California Press.

Rohdenburg, Günter. 1996. "Cognitive complexity and increased grammatical explicitness in English" *Cognitive Linguistics*. 149-182.

Rohdenburg, Günter. 2003. "Cognitive complexity and *horror aequi* as factors determining the use of interrogative clause linkers in English" *Topics in English Linguistics* 43. Mouton de Gruyter.

Schneider, Edgar W. 2007. *Postcolonial English: Varieties around the world*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Schneider, Edgar W. 2011. *English Around the World. An Introduction*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Sinclair, John, ed. First published 1987. *Collins Cobuild English Language Dictionary*. London: William Collins Sons & Co Ltd.

Sinclair, John, ed. 2006. *Collins Cobuild Advanced Learner's English Dictionary*. Fifth edition. Great Britain: Harper Collins Publishers.

Smith, Michael B., Joyce Escobedo. 2001. "The Semantics of *to*-infinitival vs. *-ing* verb complement constructions in English" *Proceedings from the Main Session of the Thirty-seventh Meeting of the Chicago Linguistic Society*. 37.1.

Quirk, Randolph, Sidney Greenbaum, Geoffrey Leech, Jan Svartvik. 1985. *A Comprehensive Grammar of the English Language*. Longman Group Limited.

2013 *Oxford English Dictionary*. Oxford University Press.

The corpus

<http://corpus.byu.edu/glowbe/>